Vigiliae Christianae

A Review of Early Christian Life and Language

VOLUME LII

BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON • KÖLN
1998

Editors-in-chief

J. den Boeft, Amsterdam
R. van den Broek, Utrecht
W.L. Petersen, State College, Pennsylvania
D.T. Runia, Leiden
J.C.M. van Winden, Leiden

Associate Editors

M. Anastos (Los Angeles) – A. Davids (Nijmegen) – R.M. Grant (Chicago) – Marguerite Harl (Paris) – J.-P. Mahé (Paris) – J. van Oort (Utrecht) – Elaine Pagels (Princeton) – R. Staats (Kiel)

© Copyright 1998 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

ISSN 0042-6032

CONTENTS

I Articles

Barnes, M.R., Eunomius of Cyzicus and Gregory of Nyssa: Two Traditions of Transcendent Causality 59
Brent, A., Ignatius of Antioch and the Imperial Cult 30
Dunn, G.D., Tertullian and Rebekah: a Re-reading of an "Anti-Jewish" Argument in Early Christian Literature 119
Fantino, J., Le passage du premier Adam au second Adam comme expression du salut chez Irénée de Lyon 418
Ferreiro, A., Priscillian and Nicolaitism 382
Frazier, F., L'Antoine d'Athanase. À propos des chapitres 83-88 de la *Vita* 227
French, D.R., Maintaining Boundaries: The Status of Actresses in Early Christian Society 293
Lamoreaux, J.C., The Provenance of Ecumenius' Commentary on the Apocalypse 88
Lössl, J., Satire, Fiction and Reference to Reality in Jerome's *Epistula* 117 172
Majercik, R., A Reminiscence of the *Chaldean Oracles* at Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 29,2: οἷον κρατήρ τις ὑπερερρύη 286
Meyer, J.R., Athanasius' Use of Paul in his Doctrine of Salvation 146
Osborn, E., The Subtlety of Tertullian 361
Pouderon, B., Note critique sur le Codex Parisinus Graec B.N. 1555 A. 204
Quispel, G., Marcion and the Text of the New Testament 349
Robertson, D.G., Stoic and Aristotelian Notions of Substance in Basil of Caesarea 393
Stramara Jr., D.F., Gregory of Nyssa's Terminology for Trinitarian Perichoresis 257
Scott, A., The Date of the *Physiologus* 430
Strobl, W., Notitiolae Quodvultdeanae 193
Vessey, M., *Opus Imperfectum.* Augustine and his Readers, 426-435 A.D. 264
Wallraff, M., Markianos—Ein prominenter Konvertit vom Novatianismus zur Orthodoxie 1
Watt, W.S., Notes on the Poems of Paulinus Nolanus 371
Youssef, Y.N., Concordance des Apophtegmata Patrum 319

Books Received 119, 225, 347, 449

II Reviews

Adler, *see* VanderKam
Amat, J., *Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 208
Bammel, *see* Hammond
Bauer, J.W., *Die Polykarpbriefe* (B. Dehandschutter) 325
Birnbaum, E., *The place of Judaism in Philo's thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes* (A.C. Geljon) 323
Bochet, *see* Moreau
Boulhol, P., *Anagnorismos. La scène de reconnaissance dans l'hagiographie antique et médiévale* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 210
Burkert, W., *Klassisches Altertum und antikes Christentum. Probleme einer übergreifenden Religionswissenschaft* (J. den Boeft) 220
Den Boeft, *see* J.C.M. Van Winden
de Vregille, *see* Neyrand
Drobner, H.R., *Archaeologia Patristica* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 113
Eymann, H.S., *Vetus Latina. Epistula ad Romanos* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 445
Évieux, P., *Isidore de Péluse, Lettres* (U. Treu) 343
Évieux, P., *Isidore de Péluse* (U. Treu) 344
Festugière, *see* Sabbah
Frede, H.J., *und* Stanjek, H., *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 445
Frede, *see* Hammond Bammel
Fuhrer, Th., *Augustin, Contra Academicos* (M. Baltes) 331
Graumann, Th., *Christus interpres. Die Einheit von Auslegung und Verkündigung in der Lukaserklärung des Ambrosius von Mailand* (M.F.G. Parmentier) 211
Gryson, R., *Vetus Latina, Esaias* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 445
Haas, C., *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (D.T. Runia) 115
Hammond Bammel, C.P., *Origeniana et Rufiniana* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 445
Hammond Bammel, C.P., *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes* (G.J.M. Bartelink) 445
Hilhorst, *see* Silverstein
Le Bouluec, A., *Clément d'Alexandrie, Les Stromates. Stromate VII* (J.C.M. Van Winden) 328
Lieu, S.N.C., *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (J. van Oort) 112
Madec, *see* Moreau
Mattei, *see* Schulz-Flügel
Meyering, E.P., *Athanasius: Die dritte Rede gegen die Arianer* (J.C.M. van Winden) 330
Monaci Castagno, A., *Il diavolo e i suoi angeli, testi e tradizioni (secoli I-III)* (V. Hunink) 338

MOREAU, M., *Oeuvres de Saint Augustin 11/2: La doctrine chrétienne. De doctrina christiana* (I. Sluiter) 334
MOXNES, H., *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (A. Reinhartz) 442
NEYRAND, L., *Apponius, Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (J.C.M. van Winden) 342
OSBORN, E., *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West* (J.C.M. van Winden) 327
RODRIGUES PEREIRA, A., *Studies in Aramaic Poetry* (G. Rouwhorst) 447
RUNIA, *see* J.C.M. VAN WINDEN
SABBAH, G., *Sozomène, Histoire Ecclésiastique, Livres III-IV* (P. Allen) 340
SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, E., *Tertullien, Le voile des vierges (De virginibus velandis)* (J.C.M. van Winden) 207
SILVERSTEIN, TH.; *and* HILHORST, A., *Apocalypse of Paul. A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions* (J. Tromp) 213
SLY, D.I., *Philo's Alexandria* (D.T. Runia) 115
STANJEK, *see* FREDE
STANJEK, *see* HAMMOND BAMMEL
VAN DEN BROEK, R., *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* (A. van den Hoek) 221
VANDERKAM, J.C., *and* ADLER, W., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (J. Tromp) 217
VAN WINDEN, J.C.M., *Arche, A Collection of Patristic Studies, edited by* J. den Boeft *and* D.T. Runia (survey) 345
WURST, G., *Das Bêmafest der ägyptischen Manichäer* (Chr. Reck) 109

MARKIANOS—EIN PROMINENTER KONVERTIT VOM NOVATIANISMUS ZUR ORTHODOXIE

VON

MARTIN WALLRAFF

Auf den ersten Blick scheint Hagiographie noch stärker als andere christliche Gattungen "Orthodoxie-selektiv" in dem Sinne zu sein, daß nur solche Texte überliefert sind, die vom Geruch der Ketzerei weit entfernt sind. Der Held hagiographischer Viten wird nicht nur allgemein in den hellsten Farben gemalt, sondern im besonderen erscheint er stets als durch und durch orthodox, nicht selten sogar prononciert als Vorkämpfer der rechten Lehre. Wenn von der letztlich siegreichen Lehrmeinung abweichende Bekenntnisse überhaupt in den Blick kommen, dann nur als negatives Zerrbild, etwa bei den Gegnern des Heiligen, die es zu überwinden gilt, oder allenfalls als zeitgeschichtlicher Hintergrund. Bei genauerem Hinsehen zeigt sich jedoch—nicht etwa, daß dieser erste Eindruck falsch ist, sehr wohl aber, daß er um eine weitere Beobachtung zu ergänzen ist: Gerade hagiographische Viten lassen in manchen Fällen historisch sehr wertvolle Rückschlüsse auf die Geschichte von Häresien zu, wenn nämlich entweder ursprünglich heterodoxe Überlieferungen nachträglich und oft nur oberflächlich orthodox adaptiert wurden oder wenn in genuin orthodoxen Überlieferungen Begebenheiten und Personen mit heterodoxen Hintergründen rechtgläubig "geschönt" dargestellt wurden.

Solche Zusammenhänge erschließen sich freilich nur sorgfältiger und mitunter mühseliger Analyse, denn natürlich müssen die Texte gegen ihre ursprüngliche Intention gelesen werden. Als weitere Schwierigkeit kommt hinzu, daß Zugänglichkeit und Erschließung des enorm umfangreichen Materials in modernen Editionen oft unbefriedigend sind, von detaillierten Untersuchungen über Verfasserschaft und Datierung der Texte gar nicht zu reden.[1] Dennoch handelt es sich um einen sehr vielversprechenden Ansatz

[1] Zum Stand der Forschung vgl. den Überblick von Jürgen Dummer, Griechische Hagiographie, in: *Quellen zur Geschichte des frühen Byzanz (4.-9. Jahrhundert)*, hrsg. v. Friedhelm Winkelmann und Wolfram Brandes, Berlin 1990, 284-296.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

patristischer Forschung, zumal die ältere Forschung gerade auf diesem Feld noch viele reizvolle Probleme unbeackert gelassen hat, sei es weil ihr ein derartig analytischer Zugang zur Hagiographie aus Pietät verwehrt war, sei es weil sie auf die Gattung insgesamt als literarisch und inhaltlich zu niedrig stehend herabgesehen hat.[2]

Der vorliegende Aufsatz setzt sich zum Ziel, den Überlieferungskomplex eines Heiligen der östlichen Kirche in diesem Sinne zu analysieren, den des Markianos *oikonomos* (Konstantinopel, 5. Jahrhundert). Seine Vita bietet erstaunlich wenig typisch "heiligenmäßige" Wunder und Taten, dafür um so mehr wertvolle Nachrichten zu Liturgie und Baugeschichte des frühen Byzanz.[3] Anders als viele andere Heilige seiner Zeit verdankt Markianos seinen Ruhm nicht seinen asketischen Neigungen, sondern seinen organisatorischen Fähigkeiten als führender Funktionär im Konstantinopolitaner Patriarchat, insbesondere auf dem Gebiet des Kirchenbaus—in einer Zeit, die für das Erscheinungsbild der neuen Hauptstadt überaus prägend war. Von heterodoxen Hintergründen ist dabei auf den ersten Blick nicht die Rede; die Analyse wird aber zeigen, daß solche vorhanden waren und ein angemessenes Verständnis der Biographie des Heiligen ohne ihre Berücksichtigung nicht möglich ist. Im Hauptteil soll die Biographie aus allen in Frage kommenden Quellen rekonstruiert werden. Das Gesamtbild, wie es sich aus den (teilweise etwas unübersichtlichen) Einzelheiten ergibt, soll am Schluß (S. 25 ff.) in knapper Form zusammengefaßt und für die Kenntnis der historischen Zusammenhänge fruchtbar gemacht werden.

---

[2] Als Beispiel aus jüngerer Zeit für den hier gemeinten Ansatz sei Clive Foss, St. Autonomus and His Church in Bithynia, *DOP* 41 (1987) 187-198 genannt, dem es ebenfalls um Novatianisches geht. (Er versucht, die *Vita Autonomi*, BHG 198, für diese Gruppierung in Anspruch zu nehmen.) Methodisch verwandt ist auch Hanns Christof Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche* (BHTh 73), Tübingen 1988, 114-157, der homöischem Überlieferungsgut in der Historiographie nachspürt.

[3] Zur hagiographischen Überlieferung s. die nächste Anm. Die Forschungsliteratur, die sich speziell mit dieser Figur befaßt, ist nicht sehr umfangreich. Der substantiellste Beitrag, der dem Material mit der nötigen Kritik zu Leibe rückt, ist der nach wie vor der von M. Lenain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, Bd. 16, Paris ^{2}1712, 161-165. Vgl. ferner AASS Jan. 1 (zuerst Antwerpen 1643), 609-17; Charles Hole, Marcianus (4), in: DCB 3, London 1882, 814 f.; R. Janin, Marciano, in: BSS 8, Rom 1967, 689; D. Stiernon, Marcian the Presbyter, in: *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, Bd. 1, Cambridge 1992, 523. Darüber hinaus wird Markianos des öfteren mehr oder minder ausführlich in der Literatur zu Bau- und Liturgiegeschichte erwähnt, weil seine Vita für diese Gebiete eine sehr wichtige Quelle darstellt, s. dazu

1. *Die hagiographischen Viten*

Vier unterschiedliche Viten des Markianos sind erhalten, die die Hauptquelle für die Biographie des Heiligen bilden.[4] Einer dieser Texte scheidet allerdings sofort aus, weil er recht kurz und ausschließlich von der metaphrastischen Vita abhängig ist.[5] Auch diese letztgenannte Vita hat geringen historischen Wert, denn sie geht im wesentlichen auf die beiden anderen Viten zurück; es ist allerdings nicht auszuschließen, daß sie im einzelnen gelegentlich auch unabhängige Informationen bietet.[6] Die beiden verbleibenden Texte, auf die sich das Interesse konzentriert, sind sehr ähnlich. Sie stimmen über weite Strecken bis in den Wortlaut hinein überein; der Hauptunterschied liegt in der Länge: Die Vita BHG 1033 bietet eine Reihe von zusätzlichen Episoden, die in BHG 1032 nicht enthalten sind. Die Frage, bei welcher der beiden Fassungen es sich um die ältere handelt, ist nicht einfach zu beantworten. Vor einer genaueren Untersuchung dieser Frage sei eine synoptische Inhaltsübersicht der drei Viten gegeben:

---

unten Anm. 84, zur bildlichen Darstellung vgl. G. Kaster, Marcianus von Konstantinopel, in: *LCI* 7, Rom 1974, 492 f.

[4] Vgl. François Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (SHG 8a), Brüssel 31957 und ders., *Novum Auctuarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* (SHG 65), Brüssel 1984 (= BHG), Nr. 1032-1034; im einzelnen handelt es sich um folgende Texte und Editionen: BHG 1032, in: A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, Bd. 4, St. Petersburg 1897, 258-270; BHG 1033, in: Manuel Io. Gedeon, Βυζαντινὸν ἑορτολόγιον. Μνημαὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ δ΄ μέχρι μεσῶν τοῦ ιε΄ αἰώνος ἑορταζομένων ἁγίων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, Konstantinopel 1899, 271-277 (hierher gehört auch die in BHG als Nr. 1033c aufgeführte Vita im Codex Vat. gr. 1638, *fol.* 175v-189v, s. Anm. 7); BHG 1034, in: PG 114,429-456; BHG 1034b, in: François Halkin, *Le ménologe impérial de Baltimore* (SHG 69), Brüssel 1985, 99-124. Diese Viten werden im folgenden nur mit Angabe der BHG-Nummer nach Seite und Zeile der hier aufgeführten Editionen zitiert. Die (dringend benötigte) kritische Edition der Texte BHG 1032/1033 mit Übersetzung und Einleitung bereitet John Wortley (University of Manitoba, Kanada) vor. Ich danke Dr. Wortley für briefliche Auskunft und Diskussion über sein Vorhaben.

[5] BHG 1034b, vgl. Halkin (s. vorige Anm.) 100.

[6] Aus der folgenden Tabelle ist zu ersehen, daß die bei Migne abgedruckte Vita BHG 1034 keine einzige Episode bietet, die nicht auch in der längeren der beiden anderen Viten (BHG 1033) enthalten wäre. Daß sie innerhalb einer Erzähleinheit oft ausführlicher ist als diese, ist in den meisten Fällen wohl durch dichterische Ausschmückung zu erklären. Die an einigen Stellen abweichende Reihenfolge der Episoden (Nr. 10, 19-24 der Tabelle) sowie ein gelegentliches Plus an Information weist jedoch darauf hin, daß die Viten BHG 1033 und 1032 nicht die einzigen Vorlagen waren.

	BHG 1033 (Gedeon)	BHG 1032 (Pap.-Ker.)	BHG 1034 (PG 114)
1. Proömium	272a,1-40	258,1-259,11	429C-432A
2. Herkunft und Familie	272a,41-b,17	259,11-25	432A-B
3. Karriere	272b,17-28	259,25-260,5	432B-C
4. Frommer Lebenswandel	272b,29-273a,5	260,6-17	432D-433B
5. Grundstück der Niko	273a,6-b,17	—	433B-D
6. Vorhersage des Gregor von Nazianz	273b,17-48	260,17-261,9	436A
7. Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche	273b,48-274a,26	261,9-28	436A-C
8. Kirchweihe	274a,26-(29)	261,29-263,30	436D-440B
9. Rettung der Anastasia vor Brand	(—)[7]	264,1-27	440B-441B
10. Hohe Kosten des Ausbaus	(274a,29)-36	264,28-265,10	449A-B
11. Erweckung der gestürzten Frau	274a,37-b11	—	441B-C
12. Vision von der Irene-Kirche	274b,11-275a,19	265,10-266,19	441D-444B
13. Ausbau der Irene-Kirche	275a,20-b,32	266,20-268,3	444C-445D
14. Reliquien des Isidoros	275b,33-276a,10	268,4-20	445D-448B
15. Tod und Beisetzung	276a,11-30	268,21-269,4	448B-D
16. Vollendung der Irene durch Verina	276a,31-43	269,4-12	448D-449A
17. Ausbau weiterer Kirchen	276a,43-b,7	269,13-22	449B
18. Auferweckung eines Toten	276b,7-15	269,22-27	449C-D
19. Wirken bei den Huren	276b,16-43	—	452C-453B
20. Betrug beim Geldwechsler	276b,44-277a,20	—	449D-452C
21. Aspars Beitrag zur Anastasia	277a,21-36	—	453D-456B

[7] Bei der in Gedeons Text an dieser Stelle befindlichen Lücke (die auch den Großteil des vorigen und einen Teil des nachfolgenden Abschnitts umfaßt) handelt es sich um einen vermutlich mechanischen Textausfall in der Handschrift, nach der Gedeon den Text ediert (Athos Koutloumousion 37, 11. Jh.; Gedeon vermutet an dieser Stelle selbst eine Lücke, S. 274, Anm. 1). Der Vat. gr. 1638 (in BHG als Nr. 1033c aufgeführt) bietet den gleichen Text ohne diese Lücke; das fehlende Stück ist fast identisch mit dem entsprechenden in der Vita BHG 1032. Aus dem Vatikancodex lassen sich auch einige kleinere Lücken der Athoshandschrift (bei Gedeon durch . . . oder [ ] markiert) heilen. Für die vorliegende Arbeit wurde dieser Codex kollationiert; er wird gelegentlich zur Ergänzung herangezogen. Die vollständige Aufarbeitung der Überlieferung bleibt natürlich der kritischen Edition von Dr. John Wortley vorbehalten (s. Anm. 4).

22. Sorge für den Klerus	277a,37-41	—	—
23. Heilung einer Römerin	277a,42-49	—	456B
24. Der nasse Mantel	277b,1-30	269,27-270,18	453B-D
25. Epilog	277b,31-45	—	—
26. Schlußdoxologie	277b,45-47	270,18-20	456C

Zunächst fällt an dieser Zusammenstellung auf, daß die Vita auch in der kürzeren Fassung von Tod und Beisetzung des Heiligen nicht am Schluß berichtet, sondern danach noch weitere Episoden anfügt, die eindeutig in seine Lebenszeit gehören. Es ist also in jedem Fall damit zu rechnen, daß auch schon die älteste erhaltene Fassung Resultat der nachträglichen Erweiterung einer (möglicherweise schon schriftlich fixierten) älteren Vita aufgrund zusätzlichen Quellenmaterials darstellt. Daß mehrere Quellen verarbeitet wurden, bestätigt der Verfasser der (längeren) Vita BHG 1033 im Epilog seiner Arbeit, wenn er schreibt: "Dies Wenige aus dem Vielen habe ich, der geringste Sergios, zusammengeschrieben, wobei ich Forschungen bei denen angestellt habe, die über diesen Vater genau Bescheid wußten, und bei einigem auch selbst zugegen war."[8] Daraus ist also nicht unbedingt zu entnehmen, daß er die erhaltene Vita BHG 1032 erweitert, denn die Aussage wäre auch für diese schon wahr. Im Gegenteil liegt in dem Hinweis auf Augenzeugenschaft ein Indiz dafür, daß sich der Schreiber in noch nicht zu großem zeitlichen Abstand zu Markianos befand. Der Epilog mitsamt diesem Hinweis fehlt in der Vita BHG 1032. Die Auffassung, daß die längere Vita, die des Sergios, die ältere ist, bestätigt sich, wenn man die "Nahtstellen" bei den in der anderen Vita fehlenden Texten genau betrachtet.[9] Daß dennoch bei manchen Episoden der Sergios-Vita der

---

[8] Ταῦτα ἐγὼ ὁ ἐλάχιστος Σέργιος ἐκ τῶν τὰ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τούτου ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμένων πολυπραγμονήσας, τισὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς παρατυχών, ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα συνέγραψα. BHG 1033, 277b,31-35. Übrigens könnte man in 276a,34 f. einen Hinweis darauf erblicken, daß Sergios mit den örtlichen Verhältnissen in Konstantinopel vertraut war: Er beruft sich dort auf eine Inschrift in der Irene-Kirche.

[9] Am deutlichsten ist das zu sehen bei dem langen Stück Nr. 19-23, das bei BHG 1032 fehlt. Der Halbsatz ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς ἄκρον καρτερίας καὶ ἀκτημοσύνης ἐλθεῖν, mit dem der Faden wieder aufgenommen wird (269,27 f.), will sich inhaltlich und grammatisch nicht recht zum neuen Kontext fügen. (Er muß natürlich zum Vorhergehenden gezogen werden, wie auch bei Papadopoulos-Kerameus durch die Absatzgliederung geschehen, doch dort gibt er nicht viel Sinn. Notfalls könnte man καρτερία mit "Selbstüberwindung" übersetzen, was zum Umarmen einer Leiche passen würde, doch ἀκτημοσύνη heißt "Besitzlosigkeit," was hier überhaupt nicht paßt. Grammatisch würde man das αὐτόν zunächst auf das Subjekt des vorhergehenden Hauptsatzes [die Leiche!] beziehen, was gleichfalls keinen Sinn ergibt.) Grammatisch wie inhaltlich glatt fügt sich

Eindruck entsteht, sie seien nachträglich zugefügt, erklärt sich, wie gesagt, am besten daraus, daß der Verfasser schon unterschiedliche Quellen zusammengearbeitet hat.[10] Darum muß nicht bestritten werden, daß er tatsächlich Augenzeuge mancher Ereignisse war. Das würde auf eine Abfassungszeit nicht allzu lange nach 500 führen.[11]

Völlige Sicherheit ist in dieser Frage nicht zu gewinnen; das ist für die weitere Analyse auch nicht unbedingt notwendig, denn die entscheidenden Perikopen stehen in beiden Fassungen. Betrachtet man den "Kern" der Vita, also diejenigen Passagen, die vor dem Tod des Heiligen berichtet werden, so ergibt sich als Hauptmotiv der Ausbau von Kirchen; neben den Kirchen der Irene und des Isidoros, die etwas knapper abgehandelt werden, steht die Geschichte der Anastasia-Kirche eindeutig im Zentrum.[12]

---

der Halbsatz dagegen in den Kontext zu Beginn der Geschichte vom nassen Mantel bei BHG 1033, 277b,3f. Ähnlich der oben zitierte Anspruch auf Augenzeugenschaft, der in BHG 1032 auf ungeschickte Weise gekürzt ist. Nach der wörtlichen Rede des Bischofs am Ende der Episode Nr. 24 folgt dort direkt mit χάριτι καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς . . . die Schlußdoxologie, der auf diese Weise ein finites Verb fehlt (270,18-20)—anders in BHG 1033, 277b,40-47. Auch bei der Geschichte Nr. 5, die in BHG 1032 fehlt, ist der Übergang nicht ganz glatt; das ὅθεν (260,17) am Anfang des Folgenden hängt in der Luft. Weniger deutlich ist ein solcher Bruch bei Nr. 11; das mag aber daran liegen, daß die Episode schon in BHG 1033 offensichtlich nachträglich eingefügt ist (s. die folgende Anm.), so daß sie sich relativ leicht wieder herauslösen ließ.

[10] An verschiedenen Stellen verraten bestimmte Formulierungen das Einarbeiten zusätzlicher Quellen. So bei der Erweckung der gestürzten Frau (Nr. 11): . . . καθάπερ καί τισιν ἑτέροις ἱστόρηται (274a,38 f.). In diesem Falle kennen wir sogar die Quelle: Sozomenos, *h. e.* 7,5,4 (hrsg. v. Joseph Bidez/Günther Christian Hansen [GCS N.F. 4], Berlin ²1995). Dort ist zwar nicht von Markianos die Rede, doch durch den Schauplatz (die Anastasia-Kirche) bot es sich an, einen Bezug auf den Heiligen herzustellen. Die ganze Formulierung ist von Sozomenos übernommen, nur wird nun das lebensrettende Gebet der versammelten Gemeinde erweitert um καὶ αὐτοῦ Μαρκιανοῦ τοῦ ὁσίου—ein schönes Beispiel für das Wachsen hagiographischer Überlieferungen. Auch zu Beginn von Nr. 17 verrät sich eine zusätzliche Quelle: ἐκεῖνο δὲ προσθεὶς ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν . . . διηγήσομαι (276a,43 f.); es ist hier zu berücksichtigen, daß Nr. 16 noch als Bestandteil der ursprünglichen Vita gelten kann, während mit Nr. 17 offensichtlich die Nachträge beginnen. Wenig später (zu Beginn von Nr. 19) wird sogar eigens begründet, wieso sich manches in den bisherigen Viten nicht findet: Es sei verschwiegen worden, um nicht bei den Ungläubigen Anstoß zu erregen (276b,16-20). Das ist verständlich, wenn man bedenkt, daß Markianos in der folgenden Szene mit Damen des horizontalen Gewerbes auftritt.

[11] Markianos starb zwischen 471 und 478, s. unten S. 25; die Abfassung sollte man nicht zu nah (wegen der Vorgänger-Viten) und nicht zu weit (wegen der Augenzeugenschaft) vom Tod des Heiligen ansetzen.

[12] Die Nummern 5-11 befassen sich mit der Kirche—und damit die knappe Hälfte

Doch bei der chronologischen Zuordnung der verschiedenen Etappen dieser Geschichte bleibt die Vita merkwürdig unkonkret, sogar unstimmig. Wann genau hat der Heilige die Kirche ausgebaut, und wann wurde sie eingeweiht? Zu Beginn erfährt man, daß das *floruit* des Markianos in die Regierungszeit des gleichnamigen Kaisers fiel (450-457).[13] Damit mag zusammenstimmen, daß er unter dem Patriarchen Gennadios (458-471) das Amt des *oikonomos* der "großen Kirche" (d. h. der Hagia Sophia) bekleidete—worin offensichtlich seine hauptsächliche Bedeutung gesehen wurde.[14] Daß ihm in diesem Amt auch die Kirchbautätigkeit oblag, ist bis zum gewissen Grad evident, und auf diese Evidenz scheint die Vita zu setzen. Denn nachdem zu Beginn das Stichwort *oikonomos* einmal fällt,[15] hört man während der langen Schilderung des Kirchbaus nichts mehr davon, um erst viel später und eher beiläufig zu erfahren, daß Markianos in der Zwischenzeit das Amt übernommen habe;[16] auch heißt es, daß die Kirchweihe unter Gennadios stattgefunden habe.[17] Bei genauerem Hinsehen stellt sich das Problem, daß Markianos in seiner Amtszeit als *oikonomos* offensichtlich schon alt war,[18] während die Geschichte vom Ausbau der Kirche an die Erwähnung dieses Amtes zu Beginn der Vita mit der Bemerkung anschließt: "Das aber

---

des "Hauptteils" der Vita. Literatur zu der Kirche (und ihrer Patronin) unten bei Anm. 27.

[13] BHG 1033, 272a,34-36; BHG 1032, 259,7-9; BHG 1034, PG 114,432A.

[14] So die Überschrift der Viten: Βίος τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μαρκιανοῦ, γενομένου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ οἰκονόμου τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (BHG 1032, 258, ähnlich BHG 1033, 271 und Vat. gr. 1638, *fol.* 175ᵛb), vgl. auch *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* 9. Januar, Nr. 2 (hrsg. v. Hippolyte Delehaye [Propylaeum ad AASS Nov.], Brüssel 1902, 379,27 f.) sowie die unten Anm. 39 zitierte Stelle aus Theodoros Anagnostes, dort auch die chronologische Bindung an Gennadios, die im übrigen in den Viten ebenfalls zum Ausdruck kommt (s. übernächste Anm.).

[15] BHG 1033, 272b,25-28; BHG 1032, 260,1-4; BHG 1034, PG 114,432C.

[16] BHG 1033, 274b,28-30; BHG 1032, 265,22-24; BHG 1034, PG 114,444A.

[17] BHG 1032, 263,5; BHG 1034, PG 114,437C. Die Möglichkeit ist nicht völlig von der Hand zu weisen, daß der Name hier nur sekundär eingefügt ist, zumal vorher nur von ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος die Rede ist (BHG 1032, 262,19; ὁ τῶν ἱερέων πρῶτος, BHG 1034, PG 114,437A). Doch führt die Datierung des Reliquientransfers (s. unten Anm. 37) auf einen ähnlichen zeitlichen Ansatz.

[18] Das ergibt sich nicht nur aus der Schilderung vom Tod des Heiligen (BHG 1033, 276a,15; BHG 1032, 268,23; BHG 1034, PG 114,448C), der man wegen ihres topischen Charakters mißtrauen könnte (Heilige werden immer sehr alt), sondern auch aus BHG 1033, 275b,3; BHG 1032, 267,12; BHG 1034, PG 114,445B. Der Annahme, daß die Amtszeit sehr lange dauerte, stehen andere chronologische Erwägungen entgegen, s. unten bei Anm. 21 (von Gennadios eingesetzt) und Anm. 73 f. (gestorben vor Verina).

geschah später. Als er aber noch jung war und gerade eben die (Priester-)weihe erhalten hatte. . . ."[19] Auch heißt es, daß er den Kirchbau aus eigener Initiative begann und aus seinem elterlichen Vermögen finanzierte; von kirchlichen Mitteln oder auch nur einem kirchlichen Auftrag ist keine Rede.[20] Wann also hat der Ausbau der Anastasia stattgefunden? Soll man sich vorstellen, daß Markianos den Kirchbau als junger Mann längst vor der Übernahme des hohen Amtes begann und sich der Bau so lange hinzog, daß die Weihe erst stattfinden konnte, als er ein alter Mann und *oikonomos* unter Gennadios war? Von einer solchen Verzögerung spricht die Vita nicht. Auch wäre dann nicht gut zu erklären, warum die zeitliche Diskrepanz in der Vita offensichtlich eher vertuscht werden soll. Zur Klärung dieser Frage muß auf andere Quellen zurückgegriffen werden.

2. *Die übrigen Quellen*

Abgesehen von den hagiographischen Viten wird Markianos in den erhaltenen Quellen nicht allzu häufig, aber doch an einigen interessanten Stellen erwähnt, die wichtige zusätzliche Information liefern. Außerdem kommen Quellen über den Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche in Betracht, auch wenn sie Markianos nicht erwähnen.

Nur recht wenig für die Datierung tragen zwei Stellen in den erhaltenen Auszügen aus dem Kirchengeschichtswerk des Theodoros Anagnostes aus. Immerhin bestätigen die beiden Notizen, daß Markianos *oikonomos* der "Großen Kirche" war und unter Patriarch Gennadios in dieses Amt kam (also frühestens 458!),[21] und der Bericht von der Rettung der Anastasiakirche bei einem Großbrand zeigt zumindest, daß er dieser Kirche tatsächlich verbunden war; außerdem ergibt sich mit dem Datum des Brandes (464) ein sicherer *terminus ante quem* für die Amtsübernahme.[22]

Etwas ergiebiger ist das Zeugnis aus der hagiographischen Überliefe-

---

[19] Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὕστερον ἐγένετο. Ἔτι δὲ νέος ὑπάρχων καὶ ἄρτι τὴν χειροτονίαν λαβών . . . BHG 1033, 272b,29-31, ähnlich auch BHG 1032, 260,4-6 und BHG 1034, PG 114,432D.

[20] BHG 1033, 272b,31-273a,12; BHG 1032, 260,6-17; BHG 1034, PG 114,432D433B.

[21] E376 und E394 (Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte, hrsg. v. Günther Christian Hansen [GCS N. F. 3], Berlin ²1995, 106 und 110); die erste Stelle wird mit vollem Text unten bei Anm. 39 zitiert. Zu Gennadios vgl. Franz Diekamp, Gennadius von Konstantinopel, in: Ders.: *Analecta Patristica* (OrChrAn 117). Rom 1938, 54-108.

[22] Zum Datum des Brandes vgl. die bei Hansen 110 im Apparat zu E394 angegebenen Stellen.

rung des Auxentios. Es sind mehrere Viten dieses in Byzanz populären Heiligen erhalten,[23] die aber alle darin übereinstimmen, daß Auxentios einer wohlhabenden und einflußreichen Familie entstammte und in seiner Jugendzeit, bevor er sich in asketische Einsamkeit zurückzog, eine Schar gleichaltriger und ähnlich gestellter junger Männer in Konstantinopel um sich gesammelt hatte, zu der auch Markianos gehörte.[24] Es werden verschiedene Erlebnisse in diesem Freundeskreis berichtet; diese Ereignisse müssen vor den nestorianischen Unruhen stattgefunden haben (also vor ca. 430), denn es wird eigens betont, daß Auxentios sich schon vorher aus Konstantinopel in die Einsamkeit zurückgezogen habe.[25] Auch wenn man diese Nachricht für wenig vertrauenswürdig hält (sie könnte eingefügt sein, um den Heiligen vor jeder Kompromittierung im nestorianischen Streit zu bewahren), bestätigt sich dieser zeitliche Ansatz in etwa auch durch sonstige Informationen über Auxentios.[26] Für Markianos folgt daraus, daß er

---

[23] Viten BHG 199-203, zur Analyse dieser Texte (Datierung, Abhängigkeiten etc.) vgl. Perikles-Petros Joannou, *Démonologie populaire—démonologie critique au XI^e siècle. La vie inédite de S. Auxence par M. Psellos* (Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa 5), Wiesbaden 1971, 53-56.

[24] BHG 199, PG 114,1380AB; BHG 203, 66,25-68,2 und 68,7-25 Joannou (s. vorige Anm.).

[25] BHG 199, PG 114,1384D; BHG 203, 76,7-33 Joannou.

[26] Vermutlich zu Recht wird der Auxentios der hagiographischen Überlieferung meist mit einem bei Sozomenos (*h. e.* 7,21,8) erwähnten Auxentios identifiziert (vgl. Jules Pargoire, Mont Saint-Auxence, *ROC* 8 [1903] 15-31; 240-279; 426-458; 550-576: 18 f.; Filippo Caraffa, Aussenzio, in: *BSS 2*, Rom 1962, 627; Joannou, *Démonologie* [wie Anm. 23] 54 f.). Daraus ergeben sich weitere chronologische Analtspunkte: Auxentios war der Sohn des Addas, der unter Konstantios, also vor 361, aus seiner persischen Heimat nach Konstantinopel gekommen war; er verheiratete sich in Konstantinopel wohl unter Theodosios I., also vor 395 (auch wenn Sozomenos hier chronologisch nicht sehr deutlich ist, kann es aus Altersgründen kaum später gewesen sein). Auxentios wird daher kaum allzu lange nach 400 geboren sein. Bedenkt man weiterhin, daß er zur Zeit der Abfassung der Kirchengeschichte des Sozomenos in den 40er Jahren schon beträchtliches Ansehen als Asket genoß, sowie daß er sich sicher mehr als zehn Jahre vor Chalkedon (451) in die Bergeseinsamkeit zurückzog (BHG 199, PG 114,1388B sowie 1396B), so folgt auch hieraus ein Datum von ca. 430 für diesen Rückzug aus der Hauptstadt. Den Datumsangaben zu Beginn der Viten BHG 199 (PG 114,1380A) und BHG 201 (3,8-11, hrsg. v. Léon Clugnet, in: *ROC* 8 [1903] 1-14) ist nicht nur deshalb nicht viel zu entnehmen, weil sie in sich nicht übereinstimmen (35. bzw. 30. Jahr des Theodosios II.) und auch nicht eindeutig interpretierbar sind (je nachdem ob man ab 402 oder 408 rechnet), sondern vor allem deshalb, weil nicht klar ist, auf welches Ereignis sie sich beziehen (Mitgliedschaft in der *schola quarta*?—so PLRE 2,205; Auftreten als Asket?—so Pargoire 21-24).

in den 20er Jahren des fünften Jahrhunderts zwar noch jung, aber doch schon erwachsen gewesen sein muß; sein Geburtsdatum wird also kaum lange nach 410 anzusetzen sein, andererseits auch nicht zu viel vor 400, sonst wäre er als Jugendgespiele des Auxentios und auch bei seinem Amtsantritt als *oikonomos* (nach 458) zu alt. Es bestätigt sich also die Aussage der Viten, daß er in seiner Amtszeit als *oikonomos* schon verhältnismäßig alt war, ebenso bestätigt sich der Eindruck, daß eine Diskrepanz zum Anastasia-Ausbau als junger Mann besteht.

Weiteres Material bieten die Quellen, die über das Geschick dieser Anastasia-Kirche berichten.[27] Wie die Markianos-Vita betont, handelt es sich um die Kirche, in der Gregor von Nazianz zu Beginn seines Episkopats die wenigen verbliebenen homousianischen Gläubigen in Konstantinopel um sich gesammelt hatte. Die Vita spricht von einer Prophezeiung, in der Gregor dem kleinen Kirchlein eine große Zukunft vorausgesagt habe.[28] Eine solche Prophezeiung findet sich in den erhaltenen Schriften des Kirchenvaters nicht, doch spricht er in seinen wehmütigen Gedichten öfter von seiner geliebten Anastasia-Kirche, der er nachtrauert.[29] Daraus, wie

---

[27] Zu der Kirche und ihrer Geschichte vgl. R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. Bd. 3,1: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarchat oecuménique. Les églises et les monastères.* Paris ²1969, 22-25, zur Lage s. auch unten Anm. 64; mit Recht hat jedoch Christoph Jungck, *Gregor von Nazianz, De vita sua*, Heidelberg 1974, 196 darauf hingewiesen, daß es für das von Janin behauptete Schwanken zwischen den Namen Anastasia und Anastasis in den Quellen keinen Beleg gibt. Gleichwohl leiten sowohl Gregor von Nazianz (s. Anm. 29) als auch Sozomenos (*h. e.* 7,5,3) den Namen Anastasia von ἀναστῆναι ab. Das genügt jedoch nicht als Grundlage für die These von Kirsch (s. unten) 1923, derzufolge es sich bei der Kirche um eine Auferstehungskirche in Anlehnung an die Jerusalemer Anastasis handelte. Vgl. ferner Gilbert Dagron, *Naissance d'une Capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, 448 und 452 über Gregor von Nazianz sowie Albrecht Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* (Poikila Byzantina 8), Bonn 1988, 444-447 über das Zeugnis der *Patria*. Bei der Märtyrerin Anastasia handelt es sich um eine Heilige etwas dubioser Überlieferung (zumindest im Osten), vgl. J.-P. Kirsch, Anastasie, in: *DACL* 1,2, Paris 1924, 1919-1924; Maria Vittoria Brandi, Anastasia, in: *BSS* 1, Rom 1961, 1041-1046; Hans Reinhard Seeliger, Anastasia, in: *LThK*³ 1, Freiburg 1993, 598. Sie wurde aber erst sekundär mit der Kirche, die wohl ursprünglich nach der Stifterin oder Grundstückseigentümerin so hieß, in Verbindung gebracht—nämlich anläßlich des Reliquientransfers nach Konstantinopel in diese Kirche (s. Anm. 37).

[28] BHG 1033, 273b,17-31, speziell wird Gregor das folgende wörtliche Zitat zugeschrieben: Ἀναστασίαν ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐπώνυμον ὄψεσθε πλατυτέραν καὶ μείζω· τάδε μοι προλέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. 273b,27-30 (= BHG 1032, 260,24 f.).

[29] *carm.* 2,1,5.16 (PG 37,1022 f. 1254-1261); 2,1,11 (= *de vita sua*) 1079 (Jungck,

auch aus den Kirchenhistorikern Sokrates und Sozomenos, ergibt sich eindeutig, daß es sich in der Tat um ein sehr kleines und schlichtes Gotteshaus gehandelt haben muß. Es ist auch nicht erstaunlich, daß den Orthodoxen nach der Regierungszeit des Kaisers Valens, der bekanntlich eine homöische Reichskirche etabliert hatte, nur ein bescheidenes Bethaus verblieben war. Interessant ist aber, was die Kirchenhistoriker außerdem über diese Kapelle zu berichten haben: Laut Sokrates "hielt Gregor von Nazianz seine Gottesdienste in einer kleinen Kirche ab, der die Kaiser später eine sehr große Kirche anbauten, die sie Anastasia nannten."[30] Diese Notiz ist zwar nicht datiert, doch ergibt sich immerhin ein klarer *terminus ante quem* für den Ausbau durch die Abfassungszeit der Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates; diese lag vermutlich 439, jedenfalls nicht viel danach.[31] Ein *terminus post quem* bildet der Pontifikat des Johannes Chrysostomos (398-404), zu dessen Zeit die baulichen Maßnahmen zwar offenbar geplant, aber nocht nicht durchgeführt waren.[32]

---

s. Anm. 27); vgl. auch *or.* 22,8,17-21 (SC 270, Mossay); 25,19,14-24 (SC 284, Mossay; diese Stelle könnte möglicherweise der Kristallisationspunkt für die in der vorigen Anm. genannte Tradition sein); 26,17,5-10 (SC 284, Mossay); 42,26,1-5 (SC 384, Bernardi).

[30] Τότε δὴ Γρηγόριος ὁ Ναζιανζοῦ μετατεθεὶς ἔνδον τῆς πόλεως ἐν μικρῷ εὐκτηρίῳ τὰς συναγωγὰς ἐποιεῖτο, ᾧτινι ὕστερον οἱ βασιλεῖς μέγιστον οἶκον εὐκτήριον προσσυνάψαντες Ἀναστασίαν ὠνόμασαν. Sokrates, *h. e.* 5,7,1; das Werk wird nach der neuen kritischen Edition zitiert: Sokrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, hrsg. v. Günther Christian Hansen, mit Beiträgen von Manja Širinjan (GCS N. F. 1), Berlin 1995. Die von Sokrates abhängige, aber ausführlichere Parallelstelle bei Sozomenos ist *h. e.* 7,5,1 f.

[31] Vgl. Martin Wallraff, *Der Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates. Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsdarstellung, Methode und Person* (FKDG 68), Göttingen 1997, 210 f. Im übrigen hat man gerade bei Sozomenos nicht den Eindruck, als spräche er über ein ganz kurz zurückliegendes Ereignis (s. unten Anm. 35).

[32] Auf der Eichensynode wurde Johannes vorgeworfen, er habe den von Nektarios zum Ausbau der Anastasia bereitgelegten Marmor verkauft (Photios, *cod.* 59 [SC 342,21 f. Malingrey/Leclerq]). Hieraus ist eindeutig zu entnehmen, daß der Ausbau noch nicht stattgefunden hat (gegen Berger, *Patria* [wie Anm. 27] 445), denn erstens bedeutet das hier verwendete Verb ἐναποτίθεμαι eindeutig "lay aside, store up" (Liddell/Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1996, s. v.) und zweitens wäre es auch kaum möglich gewesen, den schon an Ort und Stelle angebrachten Marmor so einfach wieder zu verkaufen— und falls es doch geschehen wäre, hätten die Gegner es gewiß nicht unterlassen, auf einen derartigen Affront ausdrücklich hinzuweisen. Dagegen spricht auch nicht die Tatsache, daß Johannes Chrysostomos in der Anastasia-Kirche mehrere Predigten hielt— im Gegenteil, denn es wird in diesen Fällen eigens betont, daß nur wenige Zuhörer anwesend waren, vermutlich eben weil nur wenig Platz war (PG 63,477 und 493, jeweils die ersten Sätze).

Damit ist eindeutig erwiesen, daß der Ausbau nicht in der Amtszeit des Markianos als *oikonomos* stattgefunden haben kann.[33] Will man nicht annehmen, daß der Heilige gar nichts mit dem Bau zu tun hatte, was angesichts seiner gut bezeugten Verbindung mit der Kirche schwer vorstellbar ist,[34] muß er also in der Tat schon als junger Mann damit beschäftigt gewesen sein. Damit bestätigt sich der aus den Viten gewonnene Eindruck, doch die damit verbundene schwierige Frage bleibt: Wie kommt es zu dem merkwürdigen Verhalten des Hagiographen, der einerseits über die wahre Chronologie Bescheid wußte, sie andererseits aber zu verschleiern suchte? Diese Schwierigkeit ist sogar noch verschärft: Sokrates und noch deutlicher Sozomenos setzen in ihren Berichten voraus, daß der Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche zu ihrer Zeit schon abgeschlossen war,[35] also mindestens 20 Jahre vor dem Amtsantritt des Patriarchen Gennadios. Wie kommt es, daß die Vita eindeutig von einer unter Gennadios vollzogenen Kirchweihe spricht?

---

[33] Als Ausweg wäre es auch denkbar, daß zwei Aus- bzw. Umbauten hintereinander stattgefunden haben, einer vor 439 und einer nach 458. Dagegen spricht jedoch eindeutig der Textbefund: In beiden Fällen ist deutlich davon die Rede, daß der Schritt von einer kleinen Kapelle zu einer großen und prächtigen Kirche vollzogen wurde; ebenso werden in beiden Fällen die Baumaßnahmen als Anbau der großen an die kleine Kirche charakterisiert (Sokrates, *h. e.* 5,7,1 bzw. Sozomenos, *h. e.* 7,5,2 und BHG 1033, 273b,48-274a,26; BHG 1032, 261,9-28). Es hat also nur einen Ausbau gegeben, und zwar sicher vor 439.—Dem steht auch das Zeugnis der *Patria Konstantinoupoleos* 103 (*Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, hrsg. v. Theodor Preger, Bd. 2 [BiTeu], Leipzig 1907, 233,16) nicht entgegen, wo davon die Rede ist, daß Gregor "vor hundert Jahren" seine Prophezeiung gegeben habe (was auf einen Ansatz um 480 führen würde; doch war Markianos zu diesem Zeitpunkt schon tot, s. unten S. 25). Andere Handschriften überliefern die Zahlen 70 oder 500, so daß der Stelle keine sichere chronologische Information abzugewinnen ist.

[34] In den schon genannten hagiographischen Viten ist das Thema so zentral, daß man es dort nicht ohne weiteres ausscheiden oder für unhistorisch erklären kann (allenfalls könnte man sich den Überlieferungskomplex ursprünglich auf eine andere Anastasienkirche bezogen vorstellen, s. dazu unten S. 21 f.). Vgl. außerdem *Patria Konstantinoupoleos* 103 (233,9-234,3 Preger); *Synaxarium* 9. Januar, Nr. 2 (379,33 f. Delahaye); Theodoros Anagnostes E394 (110,21-25 Hansen, nur die Rettung vor dem Brand); Georgios Monachos, *chron. brev.* 198,12; 209,6 (PG 110,705A.757A). Im einzelnen ist bei diesen Quellen freilich nicht immer klar, inwieweit sie von der hagiographischen Überlieferung unabhängig sind.

[35] Bei Sokrates (s. oben Anm. 30) wird man das aus dem verwendeten Präteritum entnehmen können; noch eindeutiger ist der Sachverhalt bei Sozomenos: Die Geschichte von der gestürzten Frau, *h. e.* 7,5,4 (s. dazu oben Anm. 10) setzt die schon ausgebaute Kirche voraus. Die abschließende Bemerkung, daß von diesem Ereignis noch jetzt (εἰσέτι νῦν) die Rede sei, zeigt einen gewissen zeitlichen Abstand.

Diese Frage löst sich, wenn man noch einmal genau über den Anlaß des Festaktes nachliest: Es ist die Rede von Kirchweihe *und* Transfer der Reliquien der Märtyrerin Anastasia in die Kirche.[36] Dieser Transfer aus dem illyrischen Sirmium nach Konstantinopel ist in der Tat für eine spätere Zeit bezeugt.[37] Ohne Zweifel liegt darin der eigentliche Anlaß des Gottesdienstes, und die Rede vom ἐγκαινισμός ist vom Hagiographen (absichtlich?)

---

[36] BHG 1032, 261,29-262,4.

[37] Kedrenos (12. Jh.), *Compendium historiarum* (hrsg. v. I. Bekker, 2 Bde, Bonn 1838-39, 1,608C): im ersten Jahr des Kaisers Leon (457); "Theodosios Melitenos" (d. i. Symeon Logothetes, 10. Jh.), *Chronographia* (hrsg. v. L.F. Tafel, München 1859, 80). Die vermutlich älteste Bezeugung, auf die diese beiden möglicherweise zurückgehen, liegt in einem kurzen Text vor, dessen Herkunft und Alter allerdings nicht geklärt sind. Es handelt sich um eine kurze "Märtyrerchronik", eine Kaisertabelle, die um Notizen über Märtyrer und Reliquien erweitert ist. Überliefert ist der Text in der Sammelhandschrift *Codex Baroccianus* 142, *fol.* 240^{r,v} direkt im Anschluß an die Auszüge aus der Kirchengeschichte des Theodoros Anagnostes, weshalb er seit der *editio princeps* (1544), die auf einem Abkömmling dieses Codex beruht, als ein Teil dieses Werkes angesehen und ediert wurde (zuletzt in PG 86/I, 212-216). Daß er dort nicht hingehört, ist schon aus dem unpassenden Anschluß (unmotivierter Sprung zurück zu Konstantin) zu erkennen. Hansen hat den Text daher mit Recht in seiner kritischen Edition des Theodoros (s. Anm. 21) nicht mehr mit abgedruckt. Außerdem haben seine Kollationen für die Edition noch eine weitere Stelle ans Licht gebracht, an der der Text überliefert ist, nämlich im *Codex Parisinus gr.* 1555 A, *fol.* 4^{v}-5^{r}, dort vor, nicht nach Theodoros stehend, außerdem in einer nach vorne und hinten etwas verlängerten Form. Aus deren Ende, das bis in die zweite Hälfte des 6. Jahrhunderts reicht, ergibt sich eindeutig, daß der Text nicht auf Theodoros zurückgehen kann. Die hier interessierende Notiz lautet: ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ [sc. Kaiser Leon I.] βασιλείας, καὶ ἐπὶ Γενναδίου πατριάρχου, ἠνέχθη ἀπὸ τοῦ Σερμίου τὸ λείψανον τῆς ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας, καὶ κατετέθη ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ αὐτῆς τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς Δομνίνου ἐμβόλοις (nach dem *Cod. Bar.*, indirekt danach in PG 86/I,216; der *Cod. Par.* weicht nur an einer Stelle durch die Wortstellung unwesentlich ab). Demnach hätte der Reliquientransfer unter Kaiser Leo und Patriarch Gennadios stattgefunden (die hagiographische Überlieferung setzt das Gleiche voraus, s. vorige Anm.), also wohl eher 458 als 457. Für die Datierung des Textes (die vielleicht einen Anhalt für das Maß seiner Zuverlässigkeit geben kann) möchte ich als freilich ganz unsichere Hypothese das Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts ansetzen, die Zeit, bis zu der die längere Form reicht.—Das Vorstehende stützt sich neben den Angaben in der genannten Edition (S. XXV zum *Cod. Par.*, S. XXVII zum *Cod. Bar.*) auf die eingehende Auskunft von Prof. Dr. Günther Christian Hansen und vor allem auf seine Kollationen aus dem Jahr 1964, in die er mir freundlicherweise Einblick gewährt hat. Dafür möchte ich ihm an dieser Stelle sehr herzlich danken. Auf die wichtige Sammelhandschrift *Cod. Bar.* 142 hat zuerst Carl de Boor aufmerksam gemacht (*ZKG* 6 [1883/84] 478-494: 491, vgl. auch *ByZ* 5 [1896] 16-23), eine Inhaltsübersicht findet sich bei Günter Gentz/Kurt Aland, Die Quellen der Kirchengeschichte des Nicephoros und ihre Bedeutung für die Konstituierung des Textes der älteren Kirchenhistoriker, *ZNW* 42 (1949) 104-141: 113-117.

irreführend zugesetzt. Dazu paßt, daß erst später im Verlaufe des Berichts gleichsam beiläufig erwähnt wird, daß Markianos in der Zwischenzeit *oikonomos* geworden ist.[38]

Wie gesagt, die Schwierigkeit verschärft sich: Wie ist das Verhalten des Hagiographen zu erklären, der von dem beträchtlichen zeitlichen Abstand zwischen Ausbau der Kirche und feierlichem Reliquientransfer wußte, ihn aber verschleiern möchte?

3. *Der Novatianismus der Markianos*

Sowohl die Viten des Auxentios als auch Theodoros Anagnostes erwähnen ein wichtiges Detail in der Biographie des Markianos, das zwar auf den ersten Blick nichts mit der erwähnten Schwierigkeit zu tun hat, dessen Fehlen in der hagiographischen Markianos-Überlieferung aber dennoch höchst auffällig ist, nämlich das ursprünglich novatianische Bekenntnis des Markianos. Bei Theodoros heißt es: "Gennadios ernannte Markianos, der der Religionsgemeinschaft der 'Reinen' angehörte und zur Kirche gekommen war, zum *oikonomos*."[39] Ähnlich in der Auxentios-Vita BHG 203: "Markianos hatte sich einstmals zu den Grundsätzen des Novatian bekannt, dann aber seinen Irrtum eingesehen, und war sogleich zur Wahrheit gelangt, wobei er der früheren Lehre abschwor."[40] Obgleich beide Quellen nur sehr knapp von Markianos sprechen, halten sie es doch für wichtig, auf die Konversion hinzuweisen. An der Zuverlässigkeit dieser Nachricht ist angesichts der Bezeugung durch zwei unabhängige Quellen nicht zu zweifeln. Im übrigen wäre auch schwer vorstellbar, warum und auf welche Weise eine solche Information "erfunden" worden sein sollte; viel eher ist es denkbar, daß diese Nachricht in der eigentlichen Markianos-Überlieferung aus apologetischen Gründen unterdrückt worden ist, während die Quellen, in denen der Heilige nur eine marginale Rolle spielt, dafür weniger Anlaß hatten. Allerdings muß angenommen werden, daß es sich wirklich um ein bewußtes Unterdrücken in der hagiographischen Überlieferung handelte. Es ist kaum denkbar, daß der Hagiograph, der so viele Informationen

---

[38] S. oben Anm. 16.

[39] προεβάλετο Γεννάδιος Μαρκιανὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς τῶν Καθαρῶν ὄντα θρησκείας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετελθόντα. E376 (106,9-11 Hansen). Über die "Reinen" als Benennung für die Novatianer vgl. Martin Wallraff, Geschichte des Novatianismus seit dem vierten Jahrhundert im Osten, *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 1 (1997) Abschnitt I.

[40] ὁ δέ γε Μαρκιανὸς τὰ Ναυάτου πάλαι στέρξας νόμιμα, ἐπειδὴ τὴν πλάνην διέγνω, ταχὺ πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπανῆλθε, τὴν προτέραν δόξαν ἐξομοσάμενος. 68,8-10 Joannou. Vgl. auch BHG 202, 279 Gedeon (wie Anm. 4) wortgleich und BHG 199, PG 114,1380.

über den Heiligen gesammelt hat, nichts von einem Faktum wußte, das für andere Quellen fast den einzigen Ansatzpunkt biographischen Interesses bietet.[41]

Wenn also Markianos ursprünglich Novatianer war, stellt sich die Frage, wann seine Konversion zur Orthodoxie stattgefunden hat. Natürlich muß sie vor seinem Amtsantritt als *oikonomos* in der Großkirche gewesen sein. Die genaue Formulierung bei Theodoros Anagnostes könnte sogar den Eindruck nahelegen, daß sie nicht sehr viel früher, oder, genauer gesagt, aus eben diesem Anlaß stattgefunden hat.[42] Ein weiteres Indiz ergibt sich aus der Auxentios-Vita BHG 199, in der Markianos als Mitglied des Kreises um Auxentios vorgestellt wird; dabei heißt es, daß er "*damals* Laie der novatianischen Religionsgemeinschaft war,"[43] also zum Zeitpunkt der gemeinsamen Unternehmungen in den 20er Jahren. Das ist zumindest insofern bemerkenswert, als im Rahmen dieser Unternehmungen auch von gemeinsamem Kirch- und Gottesdienstbesuch die Rede ist. Offenbar sieht der Hagiograph in dem unterschiedlichen Bekenntnis der Gefährten dabei kein Hindernis. Das ist im übrigen auch deshalb historisch plausibel, weil die Nähe der Konstantinopolitaner Novatianergemeinde zur Großkirche auch in anderen Quellen bezeugt ist. In der Verfolgungszeit des vierten Jahrhunderts war es sogar zur Gewährung des Gastrechtes in Kirchen und in der Folge fast zur Union gekommen.[44]

---

[41] Freilich ist es schwer zu entscheiden, in welchem Stadium der Überlieferung dieses Unterdrücken stattgefunden hat. Es wäre möglich, daß schon die Quelle der Vita des Sergios (BHG 1033) den Sachverhalt unterschlagen hat.

[42] Dafür spricht der Gebrauch der Partizipien Präsens und Aorist (ὄντα und μετελθόντα, s. Anm. 39). Freilich ist es denkbar, daß der Tempusgebrauch hier nicht so streng ist (gerade bei εἶναι).

[43] . . . Μαρκιανῷ τῷ τηνικαῦτα λαϊκῷ ὄντι τῆς τῶν Ναυατιανῶν θρησκείας, μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ τῇ καθολικῇ πίστει ἑνωθέντι καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἁγιωτάτης Μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐμπιστευθέντι. PG 114,1380B; auch hier wird also von Konversion und Amtsübernahme in einem Zuge berichtet. Tillemont, *Mémoires* (wie Anm. 3) 16,162 faßt den Hergang ebenfalls so auf. Interessant ist in diesem Zusammenhang eine Beobachtung von Jean Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les* ὀφφίκια *de l'église byzantine* (AOC 11), Paris 1970, 17, Anm. 1, dem aufgefallen ist, daß die Vita BHG 1033, 272b,25-28 von der Amtsübernahme des Markianos als *oikonomos* mit einer ungewöhnlichen Formulierung berichtet (ἀναγκάζεται ἐκ κοινῆς . . . τῶν αὐτὸν ἐπισταμένων μαρτυρίας οἰκόνομος γενέσθαι). Eine derartige Erwähnung des Elementes der Akklamation ist bei der Übernahme eines kirchlichen Verwaltungsamtes nicht üblich, sondern nur bei Ordinationen. Daß eine solche tatsächlich stattgefunden hat, ließe sich durch die gleichzeitige Konversion plausibel machen, s. unten S. 22 zu den Modalitäten bei Konversionen.

[44] Sokrates, *h. e.* 2,38,26; 4,9,1-7; vgl. auch 7,25,15. Sokrates, vermutlich selbst

Wie verhält sich nun der Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche zu der Konversion? Auf den ersten Blick scheint klar zu sein, daß Markianos zur Großkirche gewechselt haben muß, bevor er sich einem so wichtigen Bauprojekt der Orthodoxie widmen konnte. Es scheint schwer vorstellbar zu sein, daß ein Novatianer sich ausgerechnet bei einem Bau engagiert haben soll, der traditionell so mit dem Geschick der homousianischen Kirche verknüpft war wie die Anastasia.[45] Sieht man jedoch genauer hin, so stellt man fest, daß diese Sicht nicht so selbstverständlich ist, wie sie zunächst erscheinen mag. Denn es ist sicher bezeugt, daß sogar Arianer an dem Ausbau der Anastasia maßgeblich beteiligt waren: Sowohl die Markianos-Viten als auch die *Patria Konstantinoupoleos* berichten, daß der Gote Aspar einen nennenswerten Beitrag zur Finanzierung geleistet hat[46]—und das obgleich die

---

Novatianer und an einem guten Verhältnis zur Großkirche interessiert (s. Anm. 60), mag hier etwas übertreiben, doch wird die Nähe der beiden Gruppierungen auch von anderen Quellen bestätigt, vgl. Wallraff, *Geschichte* (wie Anm. 39).

[45] Deshalb könnte er trotzdem in den 20er Jahren freundschaftlichen Umgang mit Auxentios gepflegt haben und Novatianer gewesen sein.

[46] BHG 1033, 277a,21-36; BHG 1034, PG 114,453D-456B; *Patria Konstantinoupoleos* 103 (233,10-12 Preger). Die *Patria* können von den Viten abhängig sein, müssen es aber nicht; dagegen spricht jedenfalls der nicht aus den Viten ableitbare Hinweis auf die Ermordung des Aspar im Jahr 471. Diesen Hinweis verstehen Tillemont, *Mémoires* (wie Anm. 3) 16,163 f. und Berger, *Patria* (wie Anm. 27) 445 f. m. E. falsch, wenn sie annehmen, daß der Kirchenausbau diese Ermordung voraussetzt, daß also ein chronologischer Irrtum vorliegen muß. Das ist dem Text jedoch nicht zu entnehmen, und im Gegenteil bezeugen die Viten, daß Aspar noch zu Lebzeiten das Projekt finanziell unterstützt hat—worin gerade das Interessante und Delikate der Konstellation liegt.—Zu Aspar vgl. Otto Seeck, Ardabur, in: *PRE 2,1*, Stuttgart 1895, 606-610; PLRE 2,164-169. Die Viten erwähnen neben Aspar auch Ardabourios (BHG 1034; in BHG 1033 ist der Text unsicher: Gedeons Manuskript liest ὁ ἐν πατρικίοις Ἄσπαρι γραφεὶς Ἀρδαβούριος—schwer verständlich, weshalb Gedeon vor Ἄσπαρι ein σύν einfügt. Der Vat. gr. 1638 hat nur ὁ ἐν πατρικίοις Ἀρδαβούριος (*fol.* 188^{r}b); dabei handelt es sich vermutlich auch nur um einen Versuch, den Text zu heilen, denn im folgenden Satz fährt die Vita im Plural fort; ursprünglich müssen wohl beide Namen genannt gewesen sein). Sowohl Vater als auch Sohn Aspars hießen Ardabourios (PLRE 2,137 f. bzw. 135-137 sowie Seeck wie oben). Welcher von beiden ist gemeint? Wenn man dem zunächst von den Viten erweckten Eindruck folgt, daß der Ausbau von Markianos als *oikonomos* veranstaltet wurde, muß es der Sohn sein, denn der Vater war schon um 430 gestorben (so AASS Jan. 1, 619). Doch wenn man den Ausbau in den 20er oder 30er Jahren ansetzt, dann kann nicht der Sohn gemeint sein; er ist erst um 425 geboren (vgl. Seeck 610). In diesem Fall wäre mit dem Todesdatum des Vaters einen *terminus ante quem* für den Ausbau gegeben. Leider läßt sich dieses Datum nicht genau bestimmen; die letzte Nachricht, die wir über Ardabourios senior haben, ist, daß er 427 den Konsulat bekleidete (vgl. Seeck 607).

Anastasia im vierten Jahrhundert ja geradezu *das* Bollwerk der Homousianer gegen die Arianer gewesen war. Diese Information wirft ein interessantes Licht auf die Trägerschaft des Bauprojektes: Aspar war einer der ranghöchsten Militärs und einflußreichsten Politiker der Zeit. Ähnliches läßt sich von Markianos behaupten—unabhängig von seiner Kirchenzugehörigkeit. Die Viten sagen über seine soziale Herkunft: "In bezug auf die Berühmtheit seines Geschlechtes sowie die Bedeutung des Vermögens seiner Eltern hieß es, er habe gewaltigen Reichtum von seinen Vorfahren ererbt und seine Familie sei mit dem kaiserlichen Geschlecht verwandt."[47] Schließlich ist daran zu erinnern, daß Sokrates als Subjekt der Bautätigkeit οἱ βασιλεῖς nennt.[48] Man hat gerätselt, wer mit dieser Bezeichnung gemeint sein könnte;[49] vielleicht wollte Sokrates absichtlich unklar sein. In jedem Falle aber ergibt sich daraus deutlich, daß der Ausbau der Kirche ein Projekt des staatlichen Establishment war, um nicht zu sagen: ein Politikum. Die Organisation und Finanzierung oblag den sozial und finanziell führenden Kreisen—ohne Rücksicht auf ihre Kirchenzugehörigkeit (oder vielleicht sogar den Heterodoxen besonders?); dem einflußreichen Aspar gelang es zumindest, als Gegenleistung durchzusetzen, daß in der neugebauten Kirche gelegentlich Gottesdienste in seiner gotischen Muttersprache und (wie wir sicher annehmen müssen) der arianischen Kirche stattfinden durften.[50] Es spricht von daher also nichts dagegen anzunehmen, daß auch Markianos

---

[47] Περὶ δὲ γένους λαμπρότητος ἢ τῆς τῶν ὑπαρχόντων τοῖς αὐτοῦ γονεῦσι περιφανείας, λέγεται πλοῦτον μὲν αὐτὸν πλεῖστον ἐκ προγόνων διαδέξασθαι, ἐκ δὲ βασιλικῆς σειρᾶς ἔχειν τὴν συγγένειαν. BHG 1033, 272b,9-14, ähnlich BHG 1032, 259,20-22, die οἰκία statt σειρά liest. Vermutlich verdient jedoch die (auch vom Vat. gr. 1638 gestützte) Lesart mit σειρά als *lectio difficilior* den Vorzug, zumal das Wort in der hier anzunehmenden Bedeutung im neuen *Revised Supplement* zu Liddell/Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1996 mit einem Beleg aus etwa der gleichen Zeit (*Codex Justinianus* 6.4.4.19b) nachgewiesen ist ("ex stirpibus"). In jedem Falle ist der Sinn klar, daß nämlich Markianos' Familie mit der des Kaisers verwandt war. Diese Aussage sollte man vielleicht nicht unbedingt für bare Münze nehmen; sie erscheint hier wenig konkret und durch λέγεται abgeschwächt (noch zurückhaltender in BHG 1034, PG 114,432B), doch kann es über die Grundaussage, die hohe soziale Stellung und die Betuchtheit der Familie, keinen Zweifel geben. Noch gesteigert und in dieser Form kaum glaubhaft spricht das *Synaxarium* 9. Januar, Nr. 2 (379,28-30 Delehaye) sogar von Kaiser Markianos und von Pulcheria als den προγόνοι des Heiligen und will wissen, daß er erst unter diesen Herrschern von Rom nach Konstantinopel gekommen sei.

[48] Text s. Anm. 30.

[49] Janin, *Géographie* (wie Anm. 27) 23.

[50] BHG 1033, 277a,32-36; BHG 1034, PG 114,456A, wobei der Vorgang natürlich für den Heiligen "geschönt" herauskommt.

zum Zeitpunkt des Baus nicht orthodox war, sondern einer der Großkirche recht nahen Minderheit angehörte, wie es die Novatianer waren. Bis zu welchem Grade die von Heterodoxen geleisteten Beiträge zu dem Bau freiwillig erbracht wurden, ist nicht mehr feststellbar. Falls Markianos damals wirklich noch Novatianer war, liegt vielleicht eine besondere Ironie der Geschichte in der Tatsache, daß sein Beitrag später Bestandteil, ja Kern der orthodoxen hagiographischen Überlieferung über ihn geworden ist.

Ein wichtiges Argument für diese Sicht liegt ohne Zweifel in dem oben beschriebenen Verhalten der Viten: Wenn Markianos *als Novatianer* an dem Ausbau der Anastasia beteiligt war, dann und erst dann wird es verständlich, daß der Hagiograph, der ja den novatianischen Hintergrund seines Helden ohnehin ganz verschweigt, den Bau möglichst nah an die spätere Tätigkeit als orthodoxer *oikonomos* heranrücken möchte. Auf diese Weise ließe sich gut erklären, wieso er zwar einerseits um die zeitliche Differenz zu wissen scheint, sie aber andererseits möglichst zu verdecken sucht. Eine sichere Entscheidung ist jedoch aufgrund des bisher vorgestellten Materials nicht möglich. Gibt es weitere Indizien?

4. *Der Novatianerbischof Markianos*

Der Name Markianos war im damaligen Konstantinopel gewiß nicht einer der häufigsten,[51] aber es sind doch eine Reihe von Trägern bekannt, darunter auch zwei Novatianer. Beide sind durch Sokrates, die Hauptquelle für den Novatianismus im vierten und fünften Jahrhundert, belegt, und beide waren prominente Mitglieder der Gemeinde: Inhaber des Bischofsamtes. Der erste Markianos war am kaiserlichen Hofe (unter anderem als Erzieher der Töchter des Kaisers Valens) sehr einflußreich und amtierte als Bischof von 384 bis 395.[52] Für die Fragestellung, um die es hier geht, kommt er aus chronologischen Gründen nicht weiter in Betracht. Der zweite Markianos wird in der Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates recht knapp ganz am Ende erwähnt:[53] Als der Novatianerbischof Paulos sein Ende nahen spürte, schrieb er den Namen seines Nachfolgers auf, versiegelte das Dokument und gab es einem Amtsbruder mit der Auflage, es solle erst

---

[51] W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen.* 3. Auflage neu bearbeitet von Gustav Eduard Benseler, Braunschweig 1863, 863 weist 12 Träger des Namens nach. Der für Konstantinopel einschlägige Band des neuen *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford 1987 ff. ist noch nicht erschienen.

[52] Sokrates, *h. e.* 4,9,5; 5,21,1.3 f.; 6,1,8.

[53] Sokrates, *h. e.* 7,46.

nach seinem Tode geöffnet werden. So geschah es. Der Name lautete Markianos; er wurde durch Akklamation des Gemeindevolkes für würdig befunden. Da er sich gerade nicht in Konstantinopel aufhielt, wurde sofort nach ihm geschickt, und es gelang, ihn in Tiberiopolis in Phrygien aufzutreiben. Er wurde unverzüglich ordiniert und inthronisiert—so geschehen am 31. Juli 438.[54] Leider hört die Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates, die stets ausführlich über die Novatianerbischöfe berichtet, mit dem Jahr 439 auf, so daß wir nichts Weiteres über seinen Pontifikat erfahren. Andere Quellen dafür gibt es nicht. Die einzige biographische Information über den neuen Bischof, die Sokrates gibt, ist ein knapper Satz beim ersten Vorkommen des Namens: "Er war in den Rang eines Presbyters aufgenommen und von ihm [sc. Paulos] im asketischen Leben unterwiesen worden."[55]

Chronologisch gesehen, wäre es gewiß gut möglich, den bisher behandelten *oikonomos* gleichen Namens mit diesem Bischof zu identifizieren (er wäre dann zum Zeitpunkt der Amtsübernahme ca. 30-40 Jahre alt gewesen), doch die wenigen biographischen Angaben genügen nicht, um eine solche Identifikation über das Maß einer bloß denkbaren Hypothese hinaus sicher zu begründen. Die Namensgleichheit und die Tatsache, daß beide Markianoi asketische Neigungen hatten, daß ferner vermutlich beide aus den höheren Gesellschaftsschichten kamen (das wird von dem Bischof nicht explizit gesagt, wir können aber aus der Reihe der Amtsvorgänger entnehmen, daß die Novatianergemeinde an hochkarätige Hirten gewöhnt war),[56] sind interessante Hinweise, die angesichts der vermutlich nicht allzu großen Novatianergemeinde in Konstantinopel ein gewisses Gewicht haben, aber zu einer sicheren Entscheidung nicht ausreichen.

In dieser Situation hilft eine merkwürdige Stelle in der hagiographischen Auxentios-Überlieferung weiter. Direkt im Anschluß an die oben (Anm. 40) zitierte Aussage über das ursprünglich novatianische Bekenntnis des Markianos heißt es in zwei Viten: "Durch ihn wurde der Glauben so gefestigt,

---

[54] §13; das richtige Datum hat Hansen aus der armenischen Übersetzung gewonnen.

[55] ... ὃς ἐν μὲν τῇ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τάξει ἐτέτακτο καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῷ τὸν ἀσκητικὸν ἐπαιδεύετο βίον, §9.

[56] Der erste Bischof Markianos war vor seiner Amtsübernahme Erzieher der Töchter des Kaisers Valens gewesen (Sokrates, *h. e.* 4,9,4-6). Bischof Sisinnios war von dem Philosophen Maximos gemeinsam mit dem späteren Kaiser Julian ausgebildet worden (5,21,2); er machte auch durch sein Verhalten die Zugehörigkeit zur Oberschicht deutlich (6,22,3-7). Chrysanthos hatte verschiedene hohe Verwaltungspositionen inne und machte sich Hoffnungen auf das Amt des ἔπαρχος von Konstantinopel, bevor er—eher gegen seinen Willen—Bischof der Novatianergemeinde wurde (7,12,2 f.).

daß er den Rang des Lehrers erhielt und den Thronos von Konstantinopel als Frucht seiner Frömmigkeit einnahm,"[57] mit anderen Worten: Bischof von Konstantinopel wurde. In Anbetracht der schon geschilderten Verdachtsmomente ist es sehr unwahrscheinlich, daß es sich hier um einen Irrtum, eine Erfindung oder eine Verwechslung handelt.[58] Der Schluß ist unausweichlich, daß der spätere *oikonomos* zunächst Novatianerbischof von Konstantinopel war, daß also die beiden Markianoi ein und dieselbe Person sind.

Diese Erkenntnis wirft auch Licht auf die oben zitierte Aussage einer anderen Auxentios-Vita, daß Markianos "damals Laie der novatianischen Religionsgemeinschaft war."[59] Das Betonen der Laienschaft wirkt an dieser Stelle etwas eigenartig, aber ein argloser Leser versteht es ohne Zweifel als Gegensatz zu der späteren Übernahme des großkirchlichen *oikonomos*-Amtes. Doch im Lichte des gerade Gesagten wird sofort klar, daß die näherliegende und zwanglosere Erklärung die ist, an dieser Stelle die Reminiszenz eines ursprünglich hier gedachten Gegensatzes zum "Bischof der novatianischen Religionsgemeinschaft" zu erblicken.

Es ist klar, daß die bis jetzt gewonnenen Erkenntnisse eine erhebliche Tragweite für verschiedene Aspekte der Kirchengeschichte des fünften Jahrhunderts haben, doch bevor diese Konsequenzen wenigstens andeutungsweise geschildert werden, ist zunächst die Rekonstruktion des historischen Faktengerüstes zu Ende zu führen. Als Zwischenergebnis ist festzuhalten: Markianos war in seiner Zeit als Novatianer vor 438 maßgeblich am Ausbau der orthodoxen Anastasia-Kirche beteiligt; die Viten könnten mit der Behauptung recht haben, daß er um diese Zeit schon Presbyter war. Daß Sokrates diese Beteiligung nicht erwähnt, sondern als Träger der Baumaßnahmen nur etwas diffus von οἱ βασιλεῖς spricht, kann seinen Grund darin haben, daß Markianos' Rolle dabei doch nicht so bedeutend war,

---

[57] ᾧ τοσοῦτον τὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐνεστήρικτο, ὡς καὶ διδασκάλου τάξιν λαχεῖν καὶ τὸν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον καρπὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λαβεῖν. BHG 202, 279a,19-23 Gedeon (wie Anm. 4); BHG 203, 68,10-12 Joannou. Im gleichen Sinne auch das Psellos-Referat in 281a,18-20 Gedeon.

[58] Gedeon meint in einer Anm. zur Stelle, der Hagiograph habe damit sagen wollen, Markianos sei Protodidaskalos der Patriarchatsschule geworden, doch erstens ist davon in keiner anderen Quelle (insbesondere nicht in den Markianos-Viten) die Rede und zweitens läßt die Aussage über den Thronos von Konstantinopel ein solches Verständnis nicht zu. Joannou, *Démonologie* (wie Anm. 23) 135, Anm. 18 denkt an eine Verwechslung mit einem der beiden Novatianerbischöfe. Damit ist er der richtigen Lösung auf der Spur, doch geht er dem (für ihn nur marginalen) Problem nicht weiter nach.

[59] BGH 199, PG 114,1380B, s. oben Anm. 43.

wie die Viten suggerieren (immerhin ist auch ein nennenswerter Beitrag von Aspar bezeugt); es kann aber auch leicht damit erklärt werden, daß es dem vermutlich novatianischen, jedenfalls überaus novatianerfreundlichen Kirchenhistoriker[60] unangenehm war, den späteren Bischof in dieser Rolle zu sehen. Im Jahre 438 wurde Markianos Bischof der Novatianergemeinde der Hauptstadt. Wie lange er das Amt ausübte, ist nicht gewiß; auf jeden Fall konvertierte er zur orthodoxen Kirche, bevor er 458 oder kurz danach (sicher vor 464) dort das Amt des *oikonomos* übernahm.

5. *Weitere Probleme*

Bis jetzt sind nur die für das Puzzlespiel der Rekonstruktion wichtigen Details zur Sprache gekommen. Einige weitere Punkte sind jedoch noch zu erwähnen, sei es weil sie mit dem Geschilderten in Verbindung stehen und daher zu Verwirrung führen bzw. u. U. auch zu abweichenden Schlußfolgerungen Anlaß geben könnten, oder weil sie helfen, das bisher gezeichnete Bild zu vervollständigen und mit Leben zu füllen.

Die Angelegenheit der Anastasia-Kirche kompliziert sich dadurch, daß noch eine zweite Kirche gleichen Namens ins Spiel kommt, und zwar interessanterweise eine novatianische. Sokrates berichtet,[61] daß die Novatianer in der Stadt Konstantinopel drei Kirchen hatten; eine davon mußte in der Verfolgungszeit unter Konstantios aufgegeben werden. Als der Abriß drohte, machte sich das Kirchenvolk mit beispielhaftem Eifer und Fleiß daran, die Kirche abzutragen und in dem Vorstadtviertel Sykai wieder aufzubauen. Später, unter Julian, wurde der Gemeinde wieder erlaubt, den ursprünglichen Ort zu verwenden; die Kirche wurde zurücktransferiert und dabei verschönert. "Zutreffenderweise," so sagt Sokrates, erhielt sie damals den Namen Anastasia; ebenso wie im Falle der orthodoxen Kirche wird also der Bezug zu ἀναστῆναι gesehen.[62] Möglicherweise war es die Hauptkirche der Gemeinschaft; jedenfalls hören wir noch an einer anderen Stelle von ihr, wo nämlich der Bischof Paulos (Markianos' Vorgänger) die Kirche in der Feuersbrunst des Jahres 433 durch sein Gebet vor der Vernichtung

---

[60] Mit sehr hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit war Sokrates selbst Novatianer, vgl. Wallraff, *Sokrates* (wie Anm. 31) 235-254; es ist aber wichtig festzuhalten, daß die hier vorgelegte Analyse des Markianos-Problems nicht an dieser Frage hängt.

[61] *h. e.* 2,38,17-26.

[62] βελτιώσαντες Ἀναστασίαν καλεῖσθαι φερωνύμως ἠξίωσαν, Sokrates, *h. e.* 2,38,24. Für den Bezug auf ἀναστῆναι bei der orthodoxen Kirche s. oben Anm. 27.

bewahrt. Dabei wird der Name der Kirche nicht ausdrücklich genannt, doch kann man aus der Ortsbezeichnung "am Pelargos" erschließen, daß die Anastasia gemeint sein muß.[63]

Es ist naheliegend, in der Markianos-Geschichte eine Verbindung mit dieser Kirche zu suchen und evtl. eine Verwechslung mit der novatianischen Anastasia zu vermuten. Zunächst ist klar festzuhalten, daß in der Tat von zwei unterschiedlichen Kirchen gleichen Namens und nicht etwa von einer einzigen Kirche zu reden ist: Das Zeugnis des Sokrates läßt daran keinen Zweifel.[64] Doch wäre es denkbar, daß die Nachrichten der Markianos-Viten über dessen Beteiligung am Ausbau der Anastasia in Wirklichkeit nicht auf die orthodoxe, sondern auf die novatianische Kirche dieses Namens zu beziehen sind, zumal es sich ja wahrscheinlich machen ließ, daß der Heilige noch in seiner Zeit als Novatianer das Projekt in Angriff nahm. Es ist klar zu erkennen, daß die Verfasser der erhaltenen Viten davon nicht nur nichts wußten, sondern umgekehrt deutlich der Meinung waren, es handele sich um die Kirche Gregors von Nazianz.[65] Man könnte jedoch annehmen, daß sie nicht etwa einen absichtlichen Falschbezug oder eine unabsichtliche Verwechslung vornahmen, sondern die Verbindung schon in der Tradition vorfanden, so daß der ausdrückliche Bezug auf Gregor Resultat der Ausschmückung ist, zumal man ja von dem (dann von Markianos unabhängigen) Ausbau der orthodoxen Anastasia wußte. Doch abgesehen davon, daß diese Konstruktion recht künst-

---

[63] Sokrates, *h. e.* 7,39,2 (vgl. mit der Ortsangabe in 2,38,14); zu der Geschichte siehe gleich im folgenden S. 24 f. Zur Lage des Pelargos vgl. R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris ²1964, 104 f. und 405.

[64] Es ist nicht gut vorstellbar, daß Sokrates bei der Kirche Gregors (*h. e.* 5,7,1) an die gleiche Kirche wie die in den vorigen Anm. erwähnte Novatianerkirche denkt: Er hätte sicherlich darauf hingewiesen. Auch deuten die topographischen Informationen über die beiden Kirchen darauf, daß sie zwar nicht sehr weit voneinander lagen, aber doch kaum identisch sein können. Die Novatianerkirche am "Pelargos" muß in der Nähe des Strategion gelegen haben (s. vorige Anm.). Dagegen wird die orthodoxe Kirche öfter als ἐν τοῖς Δομνίνου ἐμβόλοις oder ἐν τοῖς Μαυριανοῦ bezeichnet, d. h. den Forschungen von Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* 344 f. zufolge weiter südwestlich zwischen Theodosios- und Konstantinsforum. Gleichwohl ist es möglich, daß die beiden Kirchen in einer gewissen Konkurrenz zueinander standen (oder von novatianischer Seite gesehen wurden). So würde sich erklären, daß Sokrates fälschlich behauptet, die orthodoxe Anastasia sei erst nachträglich, beim Ausbau so benannt worden (vgl. dagegen die bei Anm. 29 gegebenen Gregor-Stellen); die Novatianer hätten dann mit ähnlichem Hintergrund diese Bezeichnung schon früher gebraucht (*h. e.* 2,38,24).

[65] S. oben Anm. 28.

lich zu werden droht,[66] ist die Vorstellung auch aus anderen Gründen unwahrscheinlich. Vor allem ist es schwer zu erklären, warum Sokrates, der in seinem siebten Buch sehr ausführlich über die Geschicke der Konstantinopolitaner Novatianer berichtet, es unterlassen haben sollte, auf einen substantiellen Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche hinzuweisen, zumal wenn der spätere Bischof der Gemeinde daran maßgeblich beteiligt war.[67] Auch ist die Verbindung des Markianos mit der orthodoxen Anastasia in den Quellen recht breit bezeugt, darunter in solchen, die möglicherweise auch auf von der hagiographischen Tradition unabhängige Überlieferung zurückgehen (etwa den Konstantinopolitaner *Patria* und dem Synaxar).[68]

Auffällig ist eine weitere Doppelung: Sowohl von der novatianischen als auch von der orthodoxen Anastasia-Kirche wird berichtet, daß sie in einer furchtbaren Feuersbrunst durch das mutige Gebet eines Kirchenmannes auf wundersame Weise gerettet wurde. Im einen Falle ist es der Novatianerbischof Paulos in dem Brand vom Sommer 433, im anderen der *oikonomos* Markianos im Sommer 464.[69] Ähnlich wie bei der Rettung der gestürzten Frau (s. Anm. 10) könnte man auch hier denken, daß nur *ein* Ereignis zugrunde liegt, das erst sekundär in den anderen Überlieferungszusammenhang aufgenommen ist. Bei näherem Hinsehen zeigt sich jedoch, daß

---

[66] Die Überlieferungselemente Prophezeiung des Gregor, *ekphrasis* des neuen Kirchbaus, Rettung der gestürzten Frau und Reliquientransfer haften eindeutig an der orthodoxen Anastasia. Es ist kaum anzunehmen, daß der Hagiograph alle diese Elemente in seine Markianos-Vita integriert hätte, wenn ihm die Verbindung seines Heiligen mit dieser Kirche nicht eine Selbstverständlichkeit gewesen wäre. Man müßte also annehmen, daß er eine Quelle hatte, die in knapper Form diese Verbindung entweder direkt aussprach oder (wegen ihrer Knappheit) eine Verwechslung mit der novatianischen Anastasia zuließ. Die Komposition der Vita bietet keinerlei Anhaltspunkt für eine solche Vermutung (die fraglichen Stücke stehen alle im "Kernbestand" der Vita, also zwischen Jugend und Tod des Heiligen, nicht nachtragsweise im Anschluß). Im übrigen ist die Angelegenheit auch chronologisch nicht plausibel: Wenn der Verfasser der ältesten erhaltenen Vita wirklich noch Augenzeuge war (s. Anm. 8), also in nicht zu großem zeitlichen Abstand gelebt hat, verbietet es sich, allzu viele Zwischenglieder anzunehmen.

[67] Für die oben (Anm. 62) erwähnte Verschönerung der Kirche kommt unser Markianos nicht in Frage: Sie hat unter Julian stattgefunden, also lange vor seiner Zeit.

[68] S. oben Anm. 34. Völlig sicher auszuschließen ist die Hypothese eines Ausbaus der novatianischen Anastasia durch Markianos freilich nicht; sie ist nur eben sehr unwahrscheinlich. Doch auch wer diese Hypothese annimmt, braucht die übrigen Teile der hier vorgelegten Rekonstruktion darum nicht abzulehnen. (Die Identifikation mit dem Bischof würde in diesem Falle nur noch wahrscheinlicher.)

[69] Zum ersten: Sokrates, *h. e.* 7,39, datiert in §8; zum zweiten: Theodoros Anagnostes E394 (zur Datierung s. Hansen im App.).

die Dinge in diesem Fall anders liegen müssen. Als primär hätte man auch hier die ältere Bezeugung anzusehen, also den von Sokrates berichteten und sorgfältig datierten Brand bei der Novatianerkirche. Aufgrund des geringen zeitlichen Abstandes des Schreibers und der genauen Schilderung verbieten sich grundlegende Zweifel über den Hergang. Der Kern dieses Berichtes müßte dann von einer Kirche auf die andere, von einem Amtsträger auf einen anderen und von einer Feuersbrunst auf die andere übertragen worden sein—nicht sehr wahrscheinlich, wenn man außerdem darauf achtet, daß die beiden Berichte trotz der Ähnlichkeit der Grundidee keine unmittelbaren Berührungspunkte (etwa gleiche Motive oder gar Anklänge in der Formulierung) aufweisen. Natürlich ist es dennoch denkbar, daß sich die orthodoxe Überlieferung in einer gewissen Konkurrenz zu der novatianischen gebildet hat (die offensichtlich enorm populär war und schon wenige Jahre später zu einer regelrechten Kultätiologie geworden war).[70]

Zur Vervollständigung der chronologischen Aspekte der Biographie ist noch das Todesdatum zu untersuchen. Dafür ergibt sich als klarer *terminus post quem* der Tod des Patriarchen Gennadios im Jahre 471,[71] denn die Viten überliefern, daß Markianos den von Gennadios initiierten Ausbau der Irene-Kirche nach dessen Tod vorantrieb.[72] Der gleiche Ausbau liefert auch einen *terminus ante quem*, denn wir erfahren, daß er nicht mehr von Markianos, sondern von der Kaiserin Verina zu Ende geführt worden ist.[73] Verina starb 484, doch mit sehr hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit kann man das Jahr 478 ansetzen, in dem sie in Ungnade fiel und ins Exil geschickt wurde; danach wird sie kaum noch Gelegenheit zu solchen Aktivitäten in Konstantinopel gehabt haben.[74] In dem Bereich 471-478 könnte man mit viel Scharfsinn das genaue Todesdatum 10. Januar 474 wahrscheinlich machen, doch bleibt dieser Ansatz mit Unsicherheiten behaftet.[75]

---

[70] Sokrates, *h. e.* 7,39,9 spricht von einem regelmäßig am 17. August gefeierten Fest zum Gedächtnis an die Errettung.

[71] Vermutlich am 17. November 471, vgl. *Synaxarium* 17. November (233,52 f. Delahaye) und dazu Diekamp, *Gennadius* (wie Anm. 21) 68.

[72] BHG 1033, 274b,25 f.; BHG 1032, 265,21.

[73] BHG 1033, 276a,31-35; BHG 1032, 269,4-8.

[74] Zu Verina vgl. PLRE 2,1156 und Wilhelm Enßlin, Verina, in: *PRE A 8,2*. Stuttgart 1958, 1546-1548, zu den Vorgängen, die zu ihrer Exilierung führten bes. 1548.

[75] Den Scharfsinn hat Tillemont, *Mémoires* (wie Anm. 3) 16,164 aufgebracht: Er nimmt an, daß die Weihe der neuen Kirche, für die das Datum 20. Januar bezeugt ist (BHG 1033, 276a,36 f.), an einem Sonntag stattgefunden haben dürfte. Im fraglichen Zeitraum war das nur im Jahr 474 der Fall (vgl. Hans Lietzmann, *Zeitrechnung der römischen Kaiserzeit, des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit für die Jahre 1-2000 nach Christus*, Berlin ^{3}1956, 8 und 25).

* *
*

Zum Schluß sollen die gewonnenen Ergebnisse zusammengefaßt und—wenigstens andeutungsweise—in einen weiteren Rahmen gestellt werden. Aus den hagiographischen Markianos-Viten sowie allen übrigen Quellen zur Biographie des Heiligen ergibt sich bei kritischer Analyse folgendes Bild: Markianos entstammte einer sehr reichen und sozial hochstehenden Familie, die aus Rom (möglicherweise im Zuge der Zuwanderungswelle unter Theodosios dem Großen) in die neue Hauptstadt des Ostens gekommen war. Sein Geburtsdatum ist etwa im ersten Jahrzehnt des fünften Jahrhunderts anzusetzen. Er gehörte der Kirchengemeinschaft der Novatianer an; diese Gemeinschaft war gut etabliert in der sozialen Elite der Hauptstadt. Als junger Mann zählte er zum Freundeskreis des Auxentios, eines Altersgenossen, der gleichfalls den höheren Gesellschaftsschichten entstammte. Dieser Kreis war geprägt von der für die Zeit charakteristischen Kombination von mondänem Leben und (bis zum gewissen Grade modischer) Askese. Etwa zur gleichen Zeit oder wenig später (vermutlich vor 430, jedenfalls aber vor 439) war Markianos in ein Bauprojekt der orthodoxen Kirche involviert—trotz (oder wegen?) seines novatianischen Bekenntnisses. Der Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche, die für die Orthodoxie besondere Bedeutung hatte, weil Gregor von Nazianz dort die homousianische Gemeinde gesammelt hatte, wurde mit großem Aufwand betrieben; neben Markianos war daran auch der Arianer Aspar beteiligt, ein weiteres Mitglied der sozialen und politischen Führungsschicht. Im Jahre 438 wurde Markianos als Nachfolger des hochangesehenen Paulos zum Bischof der Novatianergemeinde

---

Falls dem so gewesen sein sollte, kann man weiter kombinieren: Einerseits sind die von Verina noch nach dem Tod des Markianos veranlaßten Baumaßnahmen relativ geringfügig (sie betreffen nur noch Details der Dekoration, BHG 1033, 276a,33-35), andererseits hatte Markianos nach dem Tod des Gennadios im November 471 (s. Anm. 71) noch eine Menge zu tun (BHG 1033, 275a,20-275b,32). Falls sein Tod, für den das Datum 10. (oder 9.) Januar überliefert wird (10. Januar: BHG 1033, 276a,29 f.; BHG 1032, 269,3 f.; BHG 1034, PG 114,448C; 9. Januar: *Synaxarium* [379,26-28 Delehaye]; allerdings sprechen die Quellen streng genommen von seinem Gedenktag, nur die metaphrastische Vita BHG 1034 vom Todestag), schon in das Jahr 472 fallen sollte, wäre ihm zu wenig Zeit geblieben; in geringerem Maße gilt das auch für 473. Wenn die Kirche zum Zeitpunkt seines Todes aber schon im wesentlichen vollendet war, wäre umgekehrt nicht zu verstehen, warum Verina mit der Weihe noch so lange gewartet haben sollte. Der beim ersten Lesen entstehende Eindruck, daß der Tod des Heiligen und die Kirchweihe mehr oder minder unmittelbar aufeinander folgten, mag also stimmen (10. und 20. Januar des gleichen Jahres). Dieses Jahr wäre dann 474 gewesen.

gewählt. Bedauerlicherweise versiegen mit dem Ende der Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates (im Jahr 439) die Quellen für Länge und Profil dieser Amtszeit. Sicher ist, daß es dem orthodoxen Bischof Gennadios bald nach seiner Wahl im Jahr 458 gelang, Markianos für das Amt des *oikonomos* an der Hagia Sophia zu gewinnen.[76] Es ist gut denkbar, daß die Konversion diesem Ereignis unmittelbar voranging und das neue Amt als eine Art "Trostpflaster" für den prominenten Konvertiten gedacht war. Eine Reihe von Tätigkeiten sind für die Amtszeit als *oikonomos* bezeugt: Ausbau der Irene-Kirche, Teilnahme an den Feierlichkeiten anläßlich des Reliquientransfers der Anastasia, Rettung der neuen Anastasia-Kirche vor der Feuersbrunst im Jahr 464, Transfer der Reliquien des heiligen Isidoros nach Konstantinopel sowie verschiedene liturgische und verwaltungstechnische Maßnahmen. Markianos starb zwischen 471 und 478 und wurde in der Kirche Johannes' des Täufers beigesetzt.

Wenn diese Rekonstruktion der Biographie in ihren Grundzügen richtig ist, ergibt sich eine Reihe von interessanten Konsequenzen. Zunächst für die Geschichte des Novatianismus: Bedauerlicherweise hören die Nachrichten über diese Sondergemeinschaft mit dem Ende der Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates, der Hauptquelle über sie, fast völlig auf. Wir können nur vermuten, daß sie im Laufe der nächsten Jahrzehnte verschwunden ist, doch wie sich dieser Prozeß abgespielt hat, bleibt im Dunkeln. Die Geschichte des Bischofs Markianos könnte ein Licht darauf werfen; denn natürlich stellt sich die Frage, was die Konversion für Auswirkungen auf die Gemeinde gehabt hat. Falls Markianos zu diesem Zeitpunkt noch das bischöfliche Amt ausgeübt haben sollte, müssen die Auswirkungen enorm gewesen sein, doch auch im anderen Falle wird die Konversion eines so prominenten Mitglieds nicht ohne Folgen geblieben sein. Um diese Folgen abschätzen zu können, muß man sich die Situation der Gemeinde vor Augen führen. Aus anderen Quellen, hauptsächlich aus Sokrates, läßt sich entnehmen, daß die Novatianergemeinde in der Hauptstadt aus zwei Flügeln bestand, die immer mehr auseinanderdrifteten.[77] Auf der einen Seite stand die Gruppe, die sich aus Kleinasien, dem unmittelbaren Hinterland Konstantinopels, speiste. In diesen ländlichen Regionen hatte der Novatianismus traditionell eine starke Basis, und er war dort sehr beständig und konservativ. Die Leute, die aus dieser Gegend nach Konstantinopel kamen, waren

[76] Vgl. Darrouzès, *Recherches* (wie Anm. 43) 16 f. zu Bezeugung und Profil dieses Amtes (sowie 35-39 und 303-309 über seine spätere Entwicklung in Byzanz).

[77] Zum folgenden vgl. Wallraff, *Geschichte* (wie Anm. 39).

überwiegend einfache Leute, die an ihrer Überlieferung festhalten wollten. Auf der anderen Seite stand eine westlich orientierte, sozial hochstehende und wohlhabende Gruppe, die—vermutlich auch aus Gründen der politischen Integration—die Gemeinsamkeiten der Novatianer mit der Großkirche besonders herausstellte. Aus dieser Gruppe rekrutierten sich die Bischöfe der Gemeinschaft. In der ersten Hälfte des fünften Jahrhunderts war es zwischen beiden Gruppen regelrecht zum Schisma gekommen, und zwar aus Anlaß der Streitigkeiten um den Ostertermin. Während die einen an dem westlichen—und seit Nikaia 325 gesamtkirchlichen—Termin (Sonntag nach dem ersten Frühjahrsvollmond) festhielten, beharrten die anderen auf der älteren kleinasiatischen Tradition (Sonntag nach dem 14. Nissan).[78] Auslöser für das Schisma war ein Presbyter namens Sabbatios, der eine Anhängergruppe, "einfache" und "von bäuerlicher Beschränktheit beherrschte Leute," wie Sokrates sagt, um sich geschart hatte und bald in offenen Gegensatz zur Mutterkirche trat.[79] Seine Sekte, die "Sabbatianer", fiel ohne die Unterstützung durch die einflußreiche und etablierte Gemeindegruppe bald der Verketzerung und in der Folge wohl der Ausrottung anheim. Was die Abtrennung der zahlenmäßig gewiß nicht unbedeutenden Sabbatianer für den anderen Flügel bedeutete, läßt sich nur vermuten. Die Nähe zur Großkirche wird sich noch verstärkt, das Bestehen auf dem novatianischen Sondergut wird sich vermindert haben. Es ist mit Sicherheit anzunehmen, daß in dieser Situation die Konversion des Bischofs zahlreiche weitere Konversionen nach sich gezogen hat. Leider wissen wir nicht, ob Markianos überhaupt noch einen Nachfolger im bischöflichen Amt hatte. Auch wenn das der Fall gewesen sein sollte, wird die Gemeinde doch durch die Verluste nach beiden Seiten hin (Sabbatianer und Orthodoxe) so viel Substanz verloren haben, daß sie sich nicht mehr lange halten konnte.

Daß Konversionen—auch vom Novatianismus—zur Orthodoxie zu dieser Zeit ein Thema waren, zeigt ein interessanter Brief, der in der Kanzlei des Konstantinopolitaner Patriarchats um die Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts entstanden ist. Darin werden die Bedingungen und Riten zur Aufnahme von Häretikern in die Kirche geschildert. Die Novatianer finden eine recht entgegenkommende Behandlung: Sie müssen einen schriftlichen Widerruf vorlegen und empfangen dann die Myronsalbung, ohne aber neu getauft

---

[78] Zu der ziemlich komplexen Frage der Ostertermine vgl. mit mehr Detail Wallraff, *Geschichte* (wie Anm. 39) Abschnitt IV.

[79] ἀκέραιοι und τῇ ἀγροικικῇ προλήψει κρατούμενοι, Sokrates, *h. e.* 7,5,5.9, vgl. auch 5,21,18: τινες τῶν ἁπλουστέρων, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τῆς Φρυγίας καὶ Γαλατίας ὁρμώμενοι.

zu werden.[80] In den Akten des Konzils von Ephesos 431 sind einige derartige Fälle bezeugt.[81] Außerdem wird bestätigt, was der Sache nach schon in Nikaia 325 beschlossen worden war, daß nämlich Kleriker nach der Konversion möglichst den gleichen Rang erhalten sollen, den sie vorher in ihrer eigenen Kirche innehatten. Dieses ist für Diakone und Presbyter im Regelfall ohne allzu große Schwierigkeiten möglich, doch schon in Nikaia war das Problem angesprochen worden, das sich in dieser Hinsicht bei Bischöfen stellt. Da ja eine Gemeinde nur einen Bischof haben soll, kann ein konvertierender Bischof sein Amt normalerweise nicht behalten, allenfalls sein Titel kann ihm belassen werden.[82] Gerade im Falle des Bischofs der Hauptstadt war dieses Problem besonders delikat. Wie schon angedeutet, ist es denkbar, daß man in dieser Situation Markianos das Amt eines *oikonomos* angetragen hat, ein kirchliches Leitungsamt im Patriarchat, das doch nicht in Gefahr stand, zu einer Konkurrenz des Bischofs zu werden.

Nicht zuletzt für die Religionspolitik der Kaiser im Osten, Theodosios' II. und seiner unmittelbaren Nachfolger, ist es bezeichnend, daß man eher auf sanften Druck und Entgegenkommen bei freiwilliger Konversion setzte als auf Ketzerverfolgungen und gewaltsame Ausrottung.[83] Dazu paßt auch, was über den Ausbau der Anastasia-Kirche erkennbar ist. Wenn es richtig ist, daß, wie Sokrates sagt, die Initiative dazu von οἱ βασιλεῖς, also von höchster politischer Stelle ausging, dann ist es gewiß ein ebenso subtiler wie wirkungsvoller religionspolitischer Schachzug, daß es gelungen ist, zwei prominente und vermögende Häretiker, den Novatianer Markianos und den Arianer Aspar, für die Finanzierung zu gewinnen, zumal stets zu bedenken ist, daß es sich um eine Kirche mit besonderer Bedeutung für die Durchsetzung der Orthodoxie in den Glaubenskämpfen des vierten Jahrhunderts handelte.

---

[80] *Epistula de eis qui ad Ecclesiam accedunt* (CPG 5983); zu Überlieferung, Lokalisierung und Datierung des Textes vgl. Wallraff, *Geschichte* (wie Anm. 39) Anm. 71.

[81] ACO 1,1,7, 100,1-105,19.

[82] Kanon 8 des Konzils von Nikaia; zur Interpretation vgl. Wallraff, *Geschichte* (wie Anm. 39) Anm. 25.

[83] Es fehlt bislang an einer umfassenden Studie zur Religionspolitik Theodosios' II., vgl. nur Adolf Lippold, Theodosius II., in: *PRE* S 13, München 1973, 961-1044; Colm Luibhéid, Theodosius II and Heresy, *JEH* 16 (1965) 13-38. Eine neue Arbeit zu diesem Thema bereitet Michael Redies als Dissertation an der FU Berlin vor (Arbeitstitel: "Säkulare Aspekte der Kirchengeschichte von der Eichensynode bis zum Konzil von Ephesos [431]").

Die Vita Marciani bietet eine Fülle von interessanten Details zu verschiedenen Themen, die sie zu einer wertvollen Quelle für die Baugeschichte Konstantinopels, Liturgiegeschichte, Sozialgeschichte und Religionspolitik macht. Die Auswertung dieser Quelle hat bis jetzt noch nicht erschöpfender Weise stattgefunden.[84] Im Rahmen dieses Aufsatzes konnten nur einzelne Aspekte vertieft behandelt werden. Doch ist zu hoffen, daß die Analyse und kritische Rekonstruktion der Chronologie eine Arbeitsgrundlage für künftige Untersuchungen bieten können.

Evangelisch-theologisches Seminar
Am Hof 1, D-53113 *Bonn*

[84] Immerhin ist auf zwei sehr hilfreiche Aufsätze zu verweisen, die sich mit Liturgie- und Baugeschichte, befassen: Robert Taft, Byzantine Liturgical Evidence in the Life of St. Marcian the Oeconomos. Concelebration and the Preanaphoral Rites, *OCP* 48 (1982) 159-170 (analysiert den Bericht von der Kirchweihe der Anastasia); Gilbert Dagron, Constantinople. Les sanctuaires et l'organisation de la vie religieuse, in: *Actes du XI^e Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne.* 3 Bde (Studi di antichità cristiana 40-42 und Collection de l'école française de Rome 122-124), Rom 1989, 1069-85, bes. 1076 f. (stellt die für die Zeit typischen Züge des Kirchbauprogramms Markians heraus).

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE IMPERIAL CULT*

BY

ALLEN BRENT

Schoedel described clearly the "staged" character of the journey of Ignatius from his native Antioch in Syria to prospective martyrdom at Rome. The martyrdom is proclaimed beforehand to the Roman Christians by Crocus the deacon and others from Ephesus, "who preceded me from Syria to Rome to the glory of God." (*Rom.* 10,1-2). Furthermore, Ignatius collects individuals who join his procession as representatives of the churches of the various cities (Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles), who come to him in Smyrna since the route selected by his guards has allowed him previously only to visit Philadelphia.

Not only did some of these representatives stay with his entourage and precede him to Rome (*Rom.* 10,2), but some were elected to congratulate the Church of Antioch on its peace (*Philad.* 10,1; *Smyrn.* 11,2-3; *Pol.* 8,1). The representative character of those who come from their Churches to join his procession is emphasised in *Tral.* 12,1 where he can say: "I greet you from Smyrna, together with the Churches of God who are present with me (ἅμα ταῖς συμπαρούσαις μοι ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ)." Thus their Churches are considered very much to be present in those sent to accompany him. Through their representatives,[1] Churches "which did not lie on my way (αἱ μὴ προσήκουσαί μοι) according to the flesh (τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ

* I would like to express my grateful thanks to Prof. H.W. Pleket for his invaluable help and advice on early drafts of this paper.

[1] Ignatius claims to see the corporate personality of the Churches which he has never visited as mysteriously represented in clerical persons. With bishop Onesimus he has "converse of mind (συνήθεια)" so that he was able to see their corporate personality, their πολυπλήθεια (*Ephes.* 1,3 and 5,1), as also in the case of bishop Polybius (*Tral.* 1,1) or bishop Damas (*Mag.* 6,1: ὥστε με τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος ἐν αὐτῷ θεωρῆσαι). See further A. Brent, The Relations between Ignatius of Antioch and the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, in *Second Century*, 8,3 (1991), pp. 151-153; A. Brent, Cultural Episcopacy and Ecumenism, in *Studies in Christian Mission* 6 (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1992), pp. 85-88.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

σάρκα) lead the way before me city by city (κατὰ πόλιν με προῆγον)." (*Rom.* 9,3; *Philad.* 10,2).

But how did both Ignatius himself, and the Churches which co-operated in this "stage management" of the martyr's procession, view the purpose of the journey? In what social context are we to place the "theatre" thus staged? We need to go beyond Schoedel's individualistic and psychologistic interpretation expressed in such words as "gaining recognition and support," and "to bring to expression their deepest hopes and fears and to channel them effectively."[2]

Ignatius describes his appearance in Rome in language that clearly implies that his act confronts Roman power with a superior, spiritual alternative. Ignatius claims (*Rom.* 2,2) that: "God judged the bishop of Syria to be found at the (sun's) setting (εἰς δύσιν) having sent him from the (sun's) rising (ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς)." Schoedel comments that: "there is a sense of movement in the bishop's mental geography strikingly different from the defenders of Roman power who speak simply of Rome ruling from the rising to the setting sun."[3] Certainly *Rom.* 6,1 represents a self-conscious reversal of imperial values on the part of a bishop who is contrasting his individual purpose with that of the Roman Emperor.[4] But Schoedel resists any interpretation of Ignatius' act as part of a contrived martyrological cult. The self-sacrificing bishop from the east is apparently simply a heroic figure proclaiming the triumph of Christian grace over the Emperor's natural power.

In what follows I will argue that Ignatius' procession to martyrdom reflects the Christian counterpart in the arena to the pagan, imperial altar. His Christian entourage are the counterparts of the pagan officials and priests. I will interpret the images with which he expresses his understanding of what is taking place in the light of the social and religious context in the city states of Asia Minor, in particular their adherence to and development of the Imperial Cult. We do well to ask whether Ignatius and his martyrdom are not set over against that cult, in the way in which he

---

[2] W. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1985), p. 12.

[3] Schoedel (1985), pp. 170-171.

[4] *Rom.* 6,1: "The furthest ends of the world profit me nothing (οὐδέν με ὠφελήσει τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου) nor do the kingdoms of this age (οὐδὲ αἱ βασιλεῖαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου): it is better for me to die (καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν) for the sake of Jesus Christ (διὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν) than to reign over earth's furthest ends (ἢ βασιλεύειν τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς)."

regards his journey to Rome as a procession securing those deified qualities of *Victoria* and *Pax*.[5] I will argue:

1. Ignatius sees his personal sacrifice (his ἀντίψυχον on the θυσιαστήριον ἕτοιμον) at Rome as centred in a cultic procession, and the comparison between his highway to victory and that of Rome's power is a cultic comparison with the developing Imperial Cult.
2. The cult is a mystery cult that parallels the imperial mysteries, in which those who participate in the martyrological drama are μιμηταί and συμμύσται. His picture of the χόρος gathered for the Eucharist, and his language about its members and their actions (χριστοφόροι, ναοφόροι, ἁγιοφόροι) mirrors what epigraphical evidence will inform us regarding the mysteries associated with the imperial cult (ἱεραφόροι, βωμοφόροι).
3. Ignatius' particular title, "Theophorus (θεοφόρος)" and therefore "bearer of God" is to be understood in comparison with the bearer of the imperial image (εἰκών) in the ritual of the imperial cult (σεβαστοφόρος, θεοσεβαστολόγος, θεο-σεβαστοφάντης). Certainly τύπος is used equivalently to εἰκών as a "statue" or as a "relief" in several inscriptions, as we shall also see. We shall argue that related with this title is the use of τύπος in the description of the bishop's office as προκαθημένος εἰς τύπον πατρός. This description also mirrors the theology implied by Domitian's changes in the ritual dress of the Emperor as *Pontifex Maximus*.
4. His use of ambassadorial titles (πρεσβεία, θεοπρεσβύτης and θεοδρόμος), and the language of their appointment (χειροτονῆσαι, συμβούλιον ἀγαγεῖν), to describe the function of clerics assigned to his martyrological procession reflects the background of ambassadors with similar titles (πρεσβύτης, πρέσβεις, ἡμεροδρόμος) and roles (τὸ συγχαρῆναι) in connection with the inscriptions of the Imperial Cult.

1. *The Foundations of Ignatius' Martyr Cult*

As they greet Ignatius in chains at Smyrna through Onesimus their bishop and representative who meets him there, the Ephesians are described

[5] Certainly Schoedel (1985), Introduction, pp. 11-12, and p. 213 saw Ignatius' view of his martyrdom in such terms ("All this makes sense if we recall how carefully planned Ignatius' whole journey appears to have been for calling out support from the churches on his route and how intimately such support figures in the bishop's reflections on the significance of his mission as a man set on unity"). Schoedel however left ill-defined the particular social and religious context which would give meaning to Ignatius' conceptualization of the various roles of those involved in his procession.

as "being imitators of God, inflamed by the blood of God." (*Ephes.* 1,1) But these words cannot in this context be interpreted simply as an indication of their general piety.[6] He claims that their piety is focused upon his coming martyrdom. They are "inflamed by the blood of God (ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ)" because they were praying that he should attain his goal of fighting with the wild beasts.

The spectacle of "the blood of God" reflected in the μίμησις of the martyr-bishop is thus the cause of their anxious haste to come to see him (ἱστορῆσαι ἐσπουδάσατε). It is therefore the martyr bishop becoming the εἰκών or τύπος of the suffering God to which they are drawn in a cult in which they will re-enact or "imitate (μιμηταὶ ὄντες τοῦ θεοῦ)" the saving event.[7] It is to be emphasised therefore that such μίμησις is clearly cultic. In the arrival of the bishop from the East at the arena of the emperor of the West we have the climax of the cultic procession which began in Antioch and gathered its members from the churches of Asia Minor to whom Ignatius wrote. As Perler pointed out, Ignatius used the rare word ἀντίψυχον as equivalent to the Pauline ἱλαστήριον or atoning sacrifice.[8] It was this that he claimed to be as he claimed members of the Ephesian Church for his cultic procession. "I am your atoning sacrifice (ἀντίψυχον ὑμῶν ἐγώ), and of those whom you sent to Smyrna for the honour of God (καὶ ὧν ἐπέμψατε εἰς Θεοῦ τιμὴν εἰς Σμύρναν)," (*Ephes.* 21,1 cf. *Smyrn.* 10,2; *Pol.* 2,3).

In this way Ignatius' sufferings become a kind of extension of his action as bishop in the Eucharist, as his words "I am God's wheat" (*Rom.* 4,1) indicate.[9] The θυσιάστηριον of the arena is an extension of the θυσιάστηριον

---

[6] Cf. Schoedel (1985), pp. 41-42.

[7] This point was established at length by H.W. Bartsch, Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien, in *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien*, 2,44 (Gütersloh: Evangelischer Verlag 1940), pp. 78-98, and only partially modified in K. Bommes, Weizen Gottes, Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Martyriums bei Ignatius von Antiochien, in *Theophaneia* 27 (Köln und Bonn: Hanstein 1976), pp. 92-107.

[8] O. Perler, Das vierte Makkabäerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien, und die ältesten Martyrberichte, in *RivAC* 9 (1949), pp. 47 ff. cf. W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford: Blackwells 1965), pp. 199 ff.

[9] For a discussion on the relationship between Eucharist and martyrdom see, G.P. Wetter, Altchristliche Liturgien: Das christliche Mysterium: Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahles, in *FRLANT* 13 (1921), pp. 117-119, 136-137; Bartsch (1940), pp. 102-106 ff., cf. Bommes (1976), pp. 61-63, 89-93. See also H. Schlier, Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen, in *BZNW* 8 (1929) (Giessen: Töpelmann 1929), pp. 152-169.

that prefigures in Ignatius' liturgical scenes (*Ephes.* 5,2; *Mag.* 7,2; *Philad.* 4). Indeed, Ignatius anticipates his experience in the arena as a kind of Eucharist in which instead of the pagan crowds there will be the Roman Christians as participants in a cult on which he himself is sacrificed on an altar that is ready (θυσιαστήριον ἕτοιμον). (*Rom.* 2,2) His words are "to be poured out as a libation to God (τοῦ σπονδισθῆναι θεῷ)," which may reflect Paul's words in *Eph.* 5,1-2.[10] But Ignatius is not simply commenting on Scripture in a social vacuum. The θυσιαστήριον ἕτοιμον has clear associations with the Imperial Cult and its offerings of *thus et vinum*, as a sacrificial term for which σπονδισθῆναι is also appropriate.[11]

In place of the church gathered for the Eucharist, as μία σάρξ . . . ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ· ἓν θυσιαστήριον . . . (*Philad.* 4), there is therefore the martyr pouring out his blood and giving his body, which he prays may be found pure bread, as God's wheat (*Rom.* 2,2; 4,1). In *Rom.* 8,3 he asks the Roman Christians to behave like the pagan spectators who express their wish for death rather than life to the arena officials for a person for whom the moment to be selected or otherwise has come. "If I should suffer (ἐὰν πάθω), you had expressed your wish [for it] (ἠθελήσατε), if I should be rejected (ἐὰν ἀποδοκιμασθῶ), you had expressed your hatred (ἐμισήσατε)."[12]

The church's prayer in the arena is not therefore that bread and wine become Christ's body and blood, but that in Ignatius' body those realities may be displayed. He exhorts them regarding the wild beasts in the arena: "Intercede to the Lord for me (λιτανεύσατε τὸν κύριον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ) that through these instruments (ἵνα διὰ τῶν ὀργάνων τούτων) I might be found God's sacrifice (θεοῦ θυσία εὑρεθῶ)." (*Rom.* 4,2) His vision of the Roman community

[10] Cf. Schoedel (1985), pp. 29-31 and p. 42.

[11] For the use of incense on Trajan's altar at Pergamon, see *SEG* XI 922-933 (Gytheum); V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, (Oxford: Clarendon 1955) no. 102 (a); *IGRR* 4, 353 b 20. See also S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, (Cambridge: U.P. 1984), p. 208. In the Hellenistic ruler cult in ptolemaic Egypt the burning of incense and libations as opposed to animal sacrifices was already common before its adaptation to emperor worship, see D. Fishwick, The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Province of the Roman Empire, in *Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans L'Empire Romain* 108 (Leiden: Brill 1991), 2,1 p. 513.

[12] The force of the two aorists (ἠθελήσατε, ἐμισήσατε) is best brought out as a once for all expression (by the crowds in the arena) of the action of the verb and translated accordingly.

has no bishop, priest, or deacon at this point, as has his visions of the communities to which he addresses his other letters,[13] but only the Roman officials and their functions in the amphitheatre. What the Roman Christians can do is to "coax" the wild beasts to devour him quickly and not try to keep them away (*Rom.* 4,2).

Given therefore that the victorious journey of the bishop of Syria from the East confronting the emperor of the West is a confrontation between rival cults, can we now in the light of the inscriptions of the Imperial Cult delineate further the character of Ignatius reverse images? What, according to Ignatius, are the features of the Christian liturgical community that mirror those of pagan emperor worship?

2. *The* χορός *and the* ἀγὼν μυστικός

The Roman community is regarded as a χορός gathered around a pagan θυσιαστήριον ἕτοιμον. The mystery-drama in which the bishop is a τύπος is now an arena scene in which he is a μιμητής of the suffering god (τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου). (*Rom.* 6,3): Ignatius invites the Roman Christians gathered in his imagination in the arena that:

> . . . in love becoming a choir (ἵνα ἐν ἀγάπῃ χορὸς γενόμενοι), you may sing to the Father in Jesus Christ (ᾄσητε τῷ πατρὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ) that God has deemed the bishop of Syria worthy to be found at the sun's setting, having despatched him from the sun's rising."
>
> *Rom.* 2,2

They are to sing as a choir at the sacrifice (χορὸς γενόμενοι), as he envisaged the Ephesians (4,1-2) formed like a choir at Eucharist:

> for your worthily esteemed presbytery, worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop (οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ), like strings to a harp (ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ); therefore in your concord and harmonious love (διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ συμφώνῳ ἀγάπῃ), Jesus Christ is sung (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ᾄδεται). And each of you should become part of that choir (οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα δὲ χορὸς γίνεσθε), that being in harmonious concord (ἵνα σύμφωνοι ὄντες ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ), receiving God's variation in unity (χρῶμα θεοῦ λαβόντες, ἐν ἑνότητι), you may sing with one voice through Jesus Christ to the father (ᾄδητε ἐν φωνῇ μιᾷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ πατρί) . . .

---

[13] For the visionary character of his description of communities that he has not visited at the Eucharistic worship see A. Brent, The Ignatian Epistles and the Threefold Ecclesiastical Order, in *JRH* 17,1 (1992), pp. 18-32.

We shall now review some epigraphical evidence which will link χορός with mystery rites in connection with the imperial cult. Our purpose will be to illuminate here the reversal of imagery that portrays Ignatius' journey to martyrdom as a procession of victory.

2.1. *The Imperial Mysteries at Pergamon*

IGRR 4, 353, from the temple of Roma and Augustus in Pergamon, is an altar inscribed on four sides and dedicated (lines a. 4-5a) to Hadrian "saviour and founder (σωτῆρι καὶ [κτί]στῃ)." But those who make the dedication are an existing choir of the imperial cult, the "hymn-singers (ὑμνῳδοί) of divine Augustus (θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ) and of the goddess Roma (καὶ θεᾶς Ῥώμης)." (a. *l.* 5b) Thirty-five names stood there originally though two have been lost (a. *l.* 17-18).

One of his family whose name survives in the mutilated lines 31-32 is Capito whose office is that of θεολόγος. This was a title that Christian tradition was to award to the Seer of the *Apocalypse.* But originally it was the title of a functionary in the imperial cult and associated with the imperial μυστηρία in which he pronounced the eulogy upon the emperor and perhaps took part in choreography in which he played the emperor's role in the drama of the cult.[14]

Provision for the celebration of the dead Augustus' birthday (b. *l.* 5: μηνὸς Καίσαρος Σεβαστῇ, γενεσίῳ Σεβαστοῦ) in the context of the imperial mysteries now follows in the inscription on the right hand side of the altar:

> The conductor is to provide (παρέξει δὲ ὁ εὔκοσμος) both for Augustus' birthday (τῇ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἐνμήνῳ γενεσίῳ) and for the rest of the birthdays of the dead and deified emperors (καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς γενεσίοις τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων) and garlands for the hymn-singers (στεφάνους τοῖς ὑμνῳδοῖς) and crowning for the mysteries (καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις στεφάνωσιν) in the choir hall (ἐν τῷ ὑμνωδείῳ) . . .
> b. *l.* 12-19

Ignatius thus also saw his communities gathered for the Sunday Eucharist or his own martyrological Eucharist as singing the victory in martyrdom of the Christian bishop rising from the East and triumphing in the arena over the Emperor. In this respect they paralleled the way in which the choir at Pergamon sung the emperor's praises. Like the imperial θεολόγοι or ὑμνωδοί of Pergamon or of Hypaepa (καθυμνοῦντες τὸν Σεβαστὸν οἶκον)

[14] H.W. Pleket, An aspect of the imperial cult: imperial mysteries, in *HThR* 58,4 (1965), pp. 337-338.

in the imperial cult,[15] there is the χορός of the Christian cult. That χορός extols that divinized quality of imperial unity that is ὁμονοία (*Ephes.* 4,2), and which was also a feature of the doxology of Clement *Cor.* 60-61. Ignatius' martyrological cult was also to celebrate the peace experienced by the Church of Antioch in Syria. Thus ὁμονοία, like the *pax deorum*, was a particular objective of the Imperial Cult which was achieved by Ignatius' Christian Cult. The hymn singers were moreover garlanded (*IGRR* 4, 353, b. *l.* 18-19: στεφάνους τοῖς ὑμνῳδοῖς καὶ τοῖς μυστηρίοις στεφάνωσιν) just as Ignatius' presbyterate are described as a "spiritual crown." (*Magn.* 13,1: ἀξιοπλόκου πνευματικοῦ στεφάνου).

When we turn to the inscriptions on the back of the altar we find that the priest (ὁ ἱερεύς) appointed for the year has, in addition to bread and wine, and "sacrificial cake (πόπανον), incense (λίβανον) and lamps (καὶ λύχνους) for Augustus (τῷ Σεβαστῷ)," to provide a cushioned bed (στρῶσιν) for the images of the *Augusti* (εἰς εἰκόνας τῶν Σεβαστῶν)." (c. *l.* 4-7) The cantor is to make similar provision of wine and a blanket. We then learn that "those who are co-opted as hymn-singers from other cities shall give 50 denaria (δώσουσιν δὲ οἱ καθιστάμενοι ἐξωτικοὶ ὑμνῳδοὶ . . . δηνάρια ν′) for the images of the *Augusti* (εἰς εἰκόνας τῶν Σεβαστῶν)." (c. *l.* 10-11) But we are provided with no further information about the role that these played in the ritual of the Imperial Cult in this inscription.

2.2. εἰκόνες *in the Imperial Mysteries*

Pleket concluded that, as part of the mysteries at Pergamon, a σεβαστοφάντης exposing "the imperial image under glaring lamplight,"[16] would have been accompanied at least on occasions by ὑμνῳδοί and θεολόγοι singing the divine emperor's praises. Though there is no reference to a σεβαστοφάντης in *IGRR* 4, 353, we find allusions to such a cultic role elsewhere (*IGRR* 4, 522 (= *OGIS* 479); 643).[17] There are also other allusions

---

[15] *IGRR* 4, 1608, c. *l.* 10-20: [. . . οἱ πά]σης Ἀσίας ὑμνωδοί τῇ ἱερω[τάτῃ τοῦ Σεβα]στοῦ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος [γενεθλίῳ ἡ]μέρᾳ συνερχόμενοι εἰς [τὰ ἱερὰ μεγα]λοπρεπὲς ἔργον εἰς τὴν [τῆς συνόδου δόξ]αν ἐπιτελοῦσιν καθυ[μνοῦντες τόν Σεβα]στὸν οἶκον . . .

[16] Pleket (1965), pp. 345-346.

[17] Pleket (1965), p. 337 mentions the Bithynian inscription (*Att. Mitt.* 24 (1899)) in which τῶν μυστηρίων ἱεροφάντης and σεβαστοφάντης are used as equivalents. Another Asian example, from Dorylaeum in Phrygia (*IGRR* 4, 522 (= *OGIS* 479)), would be an Hadrianic inscription erected by Asklepiades son of Stratonikos θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς καὶ θεαῖς Σεβασταῖς καὶ Ὁμονοίᾳ Σεβαστῇ καὶ θεᾷ Ῥώμῃ. His title is σεβαστοφάντης διὰ βίου καὶ ἱερεύς.

to ὑμνῳδοί of the imperial cult at Pergamon, for example Asia (Hypaepa).[18] Clearly the λύχνοι, the στρῶσις, the οἶνος, the ἄρτος, the λίβανος and the πόπανον together with the ὕμνοι of the ὑμνῳδοί all have reference to mystery-rites involving the εἰκόνες of the dead and deified emperors (τῶν Σεβαστῶν).

In order to locate the function of these εἰκόνες in the ritual of the cult, we need to refer to *SEG* 6,59 (= *IGRR* 3, 209), which is the "decree of the international association of the craftsmen of Dionysus (ψήφισμα τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνειτῶν)" (*l.* 1-5) from Ankyra. The occassion is the incorporation of the cult of the emperor Hadrian into that of Dionysus and Hadrian's name is added to the association's title as the "new Dionysus" (καὶ Αὐτοκράτορα Τραϊανὸν Ἁδριανὸν Σεβαστὸν Καίσαρα νέον Διόνυσον). Here we find that it is the honoured benefaction of Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus to "exhibit the mystery-spectacle (ἀγωνοθετῆσαι τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν μυστικόν)."

Pompeianus summoned (τοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς ἀνεκαλέσατο) the contestants "already on their highway with anxious speed (τῷ τε τάχει τῆς σπουδῆς ὁδεύοντας)," and "he provided (ἐπήρκεσεν) for every part of the mystery (παντὶ μέρει τοῦ μυστηρίου)." Ignatius too found the Ephesians anxious for the spectacle of his martyrdom (1,5: ἱστορῆσαι ἐσπουδάσατε), just as he regards all of them through their representatives as "companions on the way (σύνοδοι πάντες)." His martyr-cult, in which he shares with Paul, is a mystery cult in which the Ephesians participate as fellow initiates (συμμύσται) who are on an highway (πάροδος). (*Ephes.* 12,2) The word μιμητής in Ignatius *Rom.* 6,3 has a parallel in the mystery cults of Isis[19] which were assimilated to those of Dionysius which were, as Hadrian's example showed, assimilated in turn to the Imperial Cult (νεός Διόνυσος = *IGRR* 4, 522 (= *OGIS* 479)). Here μιμητής is used, with its cognates, μιμούμενος τὰ ἱερὰ and μιμήματα τῶν τότε παθημάτων, in the sense of actor in that participants

---

[18] *IGRR* 4, 1608 (Claudius): a. *l.* 10: οἱ ὑμνωδοὶ ἀνέθηκαν κατὰ τὸ γενόμε[νον] ψήφισμα ἐν Περγάμῳ ὑπὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς [συνό]δου ἐγγράψαντες ὅσα δίκαια [καὶ φιλάν]θρωπά ἐστιν αὐτοῖς δεδομέ[να ὑπ' αὐτοῦ], and b. *l.* 5 . . . [τῇ ἱερ]ᾷ ὑμνωδῶν [συνόδῳ χαίρειν] . . .

[19] Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 27 where Isis is described as "having intermixed with the most holy rites (ταῖς ἁγιωτάταις ἀναμίξασα τελεταῖς), images and suggestions and representations of her sufferings at that time (εἰκόνας καὶ ὑπονοίας καὶ μιμήματα τῶν τότε παθημάτων) . . ." Cf. The mysteries of Attis in Lucian, *De Dea Syria* 15: Ῥέῃ δὲ τέμνονται καὶ Ἄττεα μιμέονται, and the Eleusinian Mysteries, *El. Lysias c. Andoc.* 30: The Hierophant says: ἐδὺς τὴν στολὴν μιμούμενος τὰ ἱερὰ ἐπιδείκνυε τοῖς ἀμυήτοις καὶ εἶπε τῇ φωνῇ τὰ ἀπόρρητα (cf. Hippolytus *El.* V, 8,39). For the equation of Isis with Dionysiac mysteries, see Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 35: ὅτι μὲν οὖν ὁ αὐτός ἐστι Διονύσιῳ τίνα μᾶλλον ἢ σὲ γιγνώσκειν, ὦ Κλέα.

acting out their role in the divine drama become mystically identified and absorbed into the realities which they act.[20]

Certainly Ignatius sees his role as bishop at one point as a mystagogue. In *Tral.* 5,2 he claims: "I am able to know (δύναμαι νοεῖν) the heavenly things (τὰ ἐπουράνια), both the angelic locations (καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικάς) and the ranks of the archons (καὶ τὰς συστάσεις ἀρχοντικάς)." In *Ephes.* 19,1 he speaks of Mary's virginity, and Christ's conception and passion as τρία μυστήρια. In *Philad.* 7,2 he speaks of the Spirit that moves him as "he exposes hidden things (τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει)." Like the high-priest of the Imperial Cult, he is "entrusted (πεπιστευμένος) with the holy of holies (τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων) . . . with the secrets of God (τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ θεοῦ)." (*Philad.* 9,1)

We can now ask what was the character of the ritual performed by those to whom were assigned the various parts in the ἀγὼν μυστικός, and how they were paralleled in Ignatius' description of his martyr-cult.

2.3. *Image bearers in the Imperial Mysteries*

We have already noted the use of εἰκόνες of the emperor and their exposure in the drama by the θεοφάντης of Dionysus. The latter became the σεβαστοφάντης when the two cults began to be assimilated as we saw taking place with Hadrian. But other symbolic objects were deployed in the ritual and persons assigned to carry them. The general term ἱεροφόρος is used of those who carry sacred objects in a pagan cultus,[21] but we find this term particularly applied in the context of the mystery play. Regarding the Isis mysteries Plutarch informs us that: "Isis . . . is wise . . ., and discloses the divine mysteries (δεικνύουσαν τὰ θεῖα) to those who truly and justly have the name of "bearers of the sacred vessels" and "wearers of the sacred robes" (τοῖς ἀληθῶς καὶ δικαίως ἱεραφόροις καὶ ἱεροστόλοις προσαγορευομένοις)." (*De Iside et Osiride* 3 (352 B))

But there were also more particular roles assigned in the ritual of the

---

[20] For the Platonic justification for this see S. Calderone, Teologia, Politica, Successione Dinastica e Consecratio in Età Constantiniana, in *Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique*, Entretiens 19: Culte des Souverains dans l'Empire Romain (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1972), pp. 236-237 and footnotes; A. Heitmann, Imitatio Dei. Die ethische Nachahmung Gottes nach der Väterlehre der zwei ersten Jahrhunderten, in *Studia Anselmiana* 10 (1940). See also Wetter (1921), pp. 66-67, pp. 124-125; Schlier (1929), pp. 135-136, 163-164 ff.; S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions: A study in the Religious Background of Early Christianity* (New York: Dover 1975), pp. 109-112, pp. 132-133, pp. 137-138, pp. 307-308.

[21] *IG* XII, 5, 291.

mysteries, some of which Robert lists as βωμοφόρος, κισταφόρος, πυρφόρος, λικναφόρος, κανηφόρος, θαλλοφόρος, φαλλοφόρος, and θεοφόρος.[22] We find the latter term becoming σεβαστοφόρος when for example the Dionysiac mysteries are assimilated with Hadrian's Imperial Cult.[23] Κισταφόρος occurs in *Syll.*[3] 2,736 (Messenia 92 B.C.) where the law for celebrating the Andanian mysteries is inscribed. Here "the sacred virgins (αἱ παρθένοι αἱ ἱεραί) as they are selected (καθὼς ἂν λάχωνται) draw the chariots (ἄγουσαι τὰ ἅρματα) laiden with chests containing the objects for the sacred mysteries (ἐπικείμενα[ς] κίστας ἐχούσας ἱερὰ μυστικά)." (VI, 1. 30-31)

Among the objects carried in the ritual of the sacred mysteries, in addition to the εἰκών of the emperor exposed by the σεβαστοφάντης, were small models or pictures of an altar. Apollonius, son of Apollonius, is given the title βωμοφόρος in Pergamon.[24] We find an explanation of this title in Apuleius' description of the Isis mysteries:

> The foremost high priests (*antistites sacrorum proceres*) . . . carried before them the distinctive attributes of the most powerful gods (*potentissimorum deum proferebant insignes exuvias*) . . . the second . . . (*secundus*) carried with both hands an altar (*manibus ambabus gerebat altaria*), that is, "a source of help," (*id est auxilia*) whose special name was derived from the helping providence of the supreme goddess (*quibus nomen dedit proprium deae summatis auxiliaris providentia*).
>
> Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, 11,10

As Apuleius makes clear, the foremost priests take precedence who carry *insignes exuviae* of the gods themselves. Furthermore, what these priests carry are not merely the portable accompaniments of ritual. They carry the clothing or attributes (*exuviae*) of the gods themselves. They are thus to be distinguished from the second group who carry the *altaria*. Thus though the second group in the Isis mystery procession may be describable as ἱεραφόροι,[25] the first group may be described as θεοφόροι. Indeed the term occurs generally in the mystery cults.

In the inscription of Agrippinilla found in Torre Nova south of Rome, we have a list of functionaries of the Dionysiac cult *c.* 150 A.D. Agrippinilla

---

[22] L. Robert, Recherches Épigraphiques, VI Inscription d'Athènes, in *Revue des Études des Anciennes*, 62 (1960), p. 323 note 6 (= *Opera Minora Selecta*, tome 2 (Amsterdam: Hakkert 1969), p. 839 note 6).

[23] L. Robert, Hellenica, II, Inscription éphébique, in *Revue de Philologie de Litérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, 13 (1939), pp. 124-125 (= *Opera Minora Selecta*, tome 2 (Amsterdam: Hakkert 1969), pp. 1277-1278).

[24] M.P. Nilsson, Zwei Altäre aus Pergamon, in *Eranos* 54 (1956), p. 172; I. *Perg.* 336.

[25] Robert (1939), pp. 124-125.

heads the list as priestess and head of the association, but two of the functionaries, Gallicanus and Dionysius, are called θεοφόροι.[26] The θεοφόρος inevitably, following the assimilation of such mysteries with the Imperial Cult, comes to be renamed σεβαστοφόρος, as in the Ephebic inscription from Athens.[27] These carried the imperial images in the mystery rite. Those divine images were cared for by the sacristan or ζάκορος τῶν θείων εἰκόνων,[28] provisions for which we have already seen to have been made in our discussion of *IGRR* 4, 353 c. *l.* 10-11. We have already met with a special official, the σεβαστοφάντης, by whom imperial mysteries were celebrated.[29]

We shall now see how in Ignatius' Martyr Cult, in direct parallel with the imperial mysteries, those who join the procession either in person or through clerical representatives are assigned roles analogous to the ἱεραφόροι, and the bishop at the centre of the cult is described as the θεοφόρος who bears a spiritual image, the τύπος of their Father God.

As their fellow-citizens in the city states of Asia Minor, in particular centres of the Imperial Cult such as Ephesus, Smyrna, or Tralles, responded to the *supplicatio* by joining the sacrificial procession, so figuratively the Christian Ephesians join Ignatius' martyr-procession. As Ignatius says:

> You are all therefore (ἐστὲ οὖν) companions on the way (σύνοδοι πάντες), God-bearers (θεοφόροι) and temple-bearers (καὶ ναοφόροι), Christ bearers (χριστοφόροι), bearers of holy things (ἁγιοφόροι), in every way adorned with the commandments of Jesus Christ (κατὰ πάντα κεκοσμημένοι ἐν ἐντολαῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).
>
> *Ephesians* 9,2

Those who come at the summons of the martyr-bishop to join his procession carry, not the εἰκών of the emperor, but, in their conducting of Ignatius, the τύπος or μιμητής of the suffering Father-God. They are analogously the equivalents of the θεόφοροι, ἱεραφόροι (ἁγιοφόροι), and βωμόφοροι (ναοφόροι) of the traditional cults paralleled by the imperial Sacristan of the divine images (ζάκαρος τῶν θείων εἰκόνων). Instead of being clothed ἐν λαμπραῖς ἐσθῆσιν for the martyr's sacrifice,[30] they instead are κατὰ πάντα

---

[26] M.P. Nilsson, The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age, in *Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae*, 8,5 (Lund: Gleerup 1957), pp. 46 and 56-57.

[27] *Ath. Mitt.* 59 (1935), pp. 77-88; Robert (1939), pp. 123-125. See also Price (1984), p. 189.

[28] Pleket (1965), p. 345; cf. Robert, *art. cit.* (cf. footnote 22), pp. 316-319.

[29] See also footnote 17.

[30] We have from Smyrna a marble tablet from the Museum and Library for the ruler cult of Attalus III in *OGIS* 332, 38: ἐν ἐσθ[ῆ]σιν λ[αμπραῖς ἐστεφανωμένους . . .].

κεκοσμημένοι ἐν ἐντολαῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The letter to the Church of Smyrna moreover is also addressed: ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ . . . ἁγιοφόρῳ.

But what of the office of the martyr-bishop at the centre of the cult at whose representation of the suffering God the Ephesians are so "inflamed?" (*Ephes.* 1,1) Ignatius continually emphasises his other name or title (ὁ καὶ θεοφόρος) at the beginning of each of the seven letters. Just as there is in his thought a continuity between the liturgy of the Eucharist each Sunday, and the prospective scene in the arena where he is destined to be the θυσιαστήριον ἕτοιμον (*Rom.* 2,2), so too I would suggest there is a continuity between Ignatius as θεοφόρος of the suffering God and the bishop as τύπος τοῦ πατρός.

3. θεοφόρος *and* τύπος *in pagan cultic imagery*

The bishop and presbytery, and, by implication or assimilation, the deacons, are described in the Ignatian letters as προκαθημένοι εἰς τύπον. This new concept in Ignatius of Antioch, we shall now argue to have grown out of the pagan symbolism of Syria and Asia Minor, which was, as the example of Hadrian as νέος Διόνυσος has shown, in process of integration with that of the Imperial cult.[31]

Each τύπος in the threefold Order makes concrete or incarnates in the Eucharistic action what it represents, namely the Father (bishop), the Son (deacons) and the spirit-filled apostolic council (the presbyters).[32] In *Magn.* 13,1: "The bishop is pre-eminent (προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου)" in this drama "as a representation of God (εἰς τύπον θεοῦ) and the presbyters (καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) as a representation of the council of the apostles (εἰς τύπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων) and the deacons (καὶ τῶν διακόνων) . . . as entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ (πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)."[33] But these realities are not static but dynamic.

Thus each of the three Orders are indeed as τύποι the counterparts to those in the imperial mysteries who carry (σεβαστοφόρος) and display (σεβαστοφάντης) imperial divine images as part of the ἀγὼν μυστικός. Indeed

---

[31] A. Brent, History and Eschatological Mysticism in Ignatius of Antioch, in *EThL* 64,4 (1989), pp. 309-329; Brent (1992), *Cultural Episcopacy*, pp. 80-81, 87-88.

[32] A. Brent, Ecumenical Relations and Cultural Episcopates, in *AThR* 72,3 (1990), pp. 262-266, A. Brent, The Relations between Ignatius of Antioch and the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, in *Second Century*, 8,3 (1991), Brent (1992) *Cultural Episcopacy*, pp. 139-143, and pp. 80-92.

[33] τύπος is not used expressly of the deacons but is here implied.

in the Isis mysteries that Plutarch found indistinguishable from those of Dionysus (in which Hadrian appeared as νέος Διόνυσος), the εἰκόνες and μιμήματα were provided by the goddess as "teaching and exhortation for piety (εὐσεβείας ὁμοῦ δίδαγμα καὶ παραμύθιον) for men and women afflicted by the same sufferings (ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναίξιν ὑπὸ συμφορῶν ἐχομένοις ὁμοίων).[34] In the same way in *Magn.* 6,1 we read Ignatius' command: "be in union with the bishop (ἑνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ) and those who are pre-eminent (καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις) as the type and teaching of incorruption (εἰς τύπον καὶ διδαχὴν ἀφθαρσίας)."

Thus Ignatius' Christian ἀγὼν μυστικός can proceed. The three Orders each portray in their particular acts the particular role that is played in their Eucharistic re-enactment of the drama of redemption. In the Upper Room, according to *Jn.* 20,19-22, there is the Spirit-filled council of the apostles, and so too these are found represented by the presbyterate. As the seated Father sends the Son, so too the bishops send the deacons to give the people their communion or to receive from them their offering for the bishop to consecrate, or to give them liturgical directions.

There is a liturgical procession or χώρησις between the three Orders like the procession within the godhead. *Mag.* 7,1-2 goes on to connect the ecclesiastical typology with that of the godhead. The deacons and presbyters proceed from the bishop and return to him just like the diaconal Son proceeds from the Father (προέλθοντα) and returns to him (χωρήσαντα). Furthermore the presbyterate represents the συνέδριον τῶν ἀποστόλων (*Mag.* 6,1), who in the Johannine Tradition (*Jn.* 20, 22), receive the inbreathing of the Spirit and who reveal the Son who came forth from and returned to the Father. The focus therefore in Ignatius of the theology of iconographical representation (τύποι) is in the clerical functions in the Eucharistic liturgy.[35]

---

[34] Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 27, see also footnote 18.

[35] It should be noted that *Tral.* 3,1-3 and related passages (*Ephes.* 5,1 and *Mag.* 13,1) require an understanding of typology in the sense of clerical persons standing εἰς τύπον, without the related passages using the term τύπος as such. It is for this reason that I would reject the amendment τόπος for τύπος in *Magn.* 6,1-2 and accept the latter as the original reading following Syriac, Arabic and Armenian texts. Certainly *Tral.* 3,1 has this reading uncontestably in *ms.* supported by *Ap. Const.* 2,26. I have demonstrated elsewhere the failure of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, the predecessor of the latter text, to understand Ignatian typology. (Brent (1991), pp. 134-145). This lack of understanding itself would, I submit, explain corrupted readings, often leading to an omission of the term, in some Greek *mss.* (Lightfoot (1885), pp. 156-157 and pp. 118-120, cf. Schoedel (1985), pp. 112-115 and pp. 141-142). At all events, a reading for *Mag.* 6,1-2 in terms

Let us therefore now turn in greater detail to the specific epigraphical evidence for the meaning both of τύπος and προκαθημένος in Ignatius' pagan religious background, in order that we may establish conclusive evidential links between these terms and what we have described as the human, episcopal εἰκόνες and μιμήματα of his Christian ἀγὼν μυστικός.

3.1. τύπος *as statue and as* εἰκών

It must be emphasized that the word τύπος usually means a "small statue" or a "relief." At Ephesus we have this word used of the upright figure (τύπον ὄρθιον) of Antoninus set into the recess of a wall.[36] We have also the statue at Rome of Marcian, proconsul of Achaia, described in the inscription that it bears as a τύπος.[37] We have further epigraphic evidence which reveals some interesting cognate terms. Whereas regularly τύπος is used to describe, in the sixth century, statues commemorating charioteers in the Hippodrome,[38] the term εἰκών is also used as its synonym in the case of one Constantine.[39] We see therefore that there is a clear, linguistic connection between the ideas of τύπος and εἰκών, which bear comparison with the sense in which Ignatius uses both terms.

In the Judaeo-Christian tradition at this time, unlike the later development of picture-icons in the later Eastern Church that hailed Ignatius as

---

of a bishop being described as προκαθημένος εἰς τόπον τοῦ θεοῦ would appear bizarre as it would seem to imply a physical "place" for God in the architecture of the Eucharistic Assembly.

[36] *CIG* 2967: τοῦτον ὃν εἰσοράᾳς, τύπον ὄρθιον Ἀντωνείνου Δωρόθεος Πτελέῃ θήκατο κρυπτόμενον . . .

[37] *IGUR* 1, 67: Μαρκιανοῦ στίλβει τύπος Ἑλλάδος ἀνθυπάτοιο.

[38] R. Aubreton and F. Buffière, *Anthologie Grecque: Deuxième Partie: Anthologie de Planude*, Tom. XIII, (Collection des Universités de France: Association Guillaume Budé: Paris 1980) no. 350, 8: σὸν δὲ τύπον τέχνη ἔξεσε, Πορφύριε. ("and, Porphyry, an artist's skill has polished your statue."); 361, 1-2: οὗτος, ἐγερσιθέητρε, τεὸς τύπος, ὅν τοι ἐγείρει ἑσμὸς, Καλλιόπα, στεφάνων. ("You who excited the spectators, this is your statue, which your host of distinguished crowns raised, O Kalliopas.")

[39] *Ibid.*, 367,5: εἰσέτι μὲν ζώοντι πόλις ποτὲ Κωνσταντίνῳ
εἰκόνα χαλκείην βαιὸν ἔκρινε γέρας· . . .
ὡς δὲ θάνεν, ποθέουσα φίλον τύπον ἄνθετο τόνδε,
ὄφρα καὶ ἐσσομένοις μνῆστιν ἔχοι καμάτων.

("Whilst Constantine was yet living, the city once judged Constantine worthy of the mean honour of a bronze statue. . . . But when he died, she dedicated this effigy in her grief for her dear one, in order that future generations might possess a memorial of his labours.") See also 351, 5-6.

one of the founding fathers of its tradition, actual inanimate and physical images were prohibited. It was therefore human figures in the liturgy that were called upon to be the counterparts (τύποι) of divine beings, as the parallels in the Christian cult of the εἰκόνες τῶν Σεβαστῶν in *IGRR* 4, 353 c. *l.* 4-7. As we have seen from Apuleius, priests in the pagan cultus "carried before them" or "displayed" (*proferebant*) the divine images (*deum insignes exuvias*). (*Metam.* 11,10) Their counterparts in Ignatius' mystery play had no physical objects that they could hold in front of them in this way. As purely spiritual iconic representatives, they could nevertheless be described as "seated forward as an effigy of" or "prominent as an effigy of," as the phrase προκαθημένος εἰς τύπον implies here.

Let us now consider the epigraphical use of προκαθημένος that is thus clearly associated with τύπος in Ignatius, and its connection with divine beings.

3.2. θεοὶ Σεβαστοὶ προκαθημένοι, *as* ἐπίσκοποι *and* μάρτυρες

I find the tendency to translate προκαθημένος as "preside" mistaken, partly on the grounds that a τύπος is displayed and does not preside, whereas it is the person who bears the τύπος that presides.[40] But the translation of this term as "preside" is mainly wrong, I believe, because it makes προκαθίζω (= προκάθημαι) and its variants the equivalent of προΐστημι and its variants. The latter is the normal term for "preside" found in the inscriptions.[41] The rarity of προκαθημένος can be illustrated by the one sole entry in *SEG*, where this term is used of cities rather than individuals. Here προκαθημένη can either refer to the presidency of a *city* such as Tarsus over—or, as I would prefer, its pre-eminence in—Cilicia Isauria.[42] Indeed

---

[40] For a more detailed analysis with further primary textual exemplifications see Brent (1991) p. 151 and note 40, and Brent (1992) *Cultural Episcopacy*, pp. 84-85 and note 31.

[41] See e.g. *SEG* XXXV, 826,9-10 which is a dedication to a priestess (γενόμενα τε τᾶς Δάματρος καὶ Κόρρας ἱέρεια τῶν τε ἱερῶν κα[λῶς καὶ] ὁσίως προέστα); likewise 113,4 (πρ]οϊστάντωσαν) describes those who preside over the Eleusinian rites of Demeter and Kore. This therefore is the usual term for presidency over the rites of a cult, Pagan or Christian (see Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1,67,4 (προεστώς); cf. Brent (1991), pp. 129-156). προκαθημένος is used in a somewhat different sense, as cited in footnote 42. For general uses of προίστημι and its derivatives see e.g. *SEG* XXVII, 758,3; XXXIII, 694,4; and XXXIV, 94.

[42] *SEG* XXIX, 1527 (Severus Alexander) (= *OGIS* 578): Τάρσος. . . . ἡ πρώτη κ[αὶ μεγίστη] καὶ καλλίστη μ[ητρόπολις] τῶν γ′ ἐπαρχείων προκαθεζομένη Κιλικίας. An inscription in honour of Septimius Severus reads (*IGUR* 1, 33): καισάρια ἡ μ[ητρό]πολις Κ[ιλικίας

Ignatius reveals his knowledge of the normal use of this term in connection with a city when he too uses it of the Church of Rome "who is pre-eminent (ἥτις καὶ προκάθηται) in the place of the district of the Romans (ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων) . . . pre-eminent in Christian charity (προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης)." (*Rom.* insc.)

But the other subject of προκαθημένος is not a city but a god or goddess, who can be called ἐπίσκοπος.

We have an inscription from Pergamon A.D. 129 (*Syll.*[3] 2, 694, *l.* 50-54) which refers to "presenting the best sacrifice (παραστα[θῆ]ναι δὲ καὶ θυσίαν ὡ[ς καλ]λίστην) to Demeter and Kore (τῇ τε[Δή]μητρι καὶ τῇ Κόρ[ῃ]), the goddesses who are pre-eminent over our city (ταῖς π]ροκαθημέναις [θε]αῖς τῆς πόλεως ἡμ[ῶν), as well as to Roma and to all the other gods and goddesses (ὁμο]ίως δὲ καὶ τῇ [Ῥώμ]ῃ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοι[ς θεοῖ]ς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις)." In such a pagan context, I would suggest that the description of Ignatius the ἐπίσκοπος, as one who is described as προκαθημένος εἰς τύπον θεοῦ, can be identified as a quite precise and intended parallel. The bishop "is pre-eminent in" the Church, just as Roma and the other gods and goddesses were in the city-states of Asia; but in his case he is not pre-eminent as a god himself but rather as a τύπος θεοῦ.

In this connection too it is not without relevance that we have an inscription from Acmonia in Domitian's reign (A.D. 85). It contains the will of Titus Praxias providing honours for his memory. Here he makes "overseers and witnesses (ἐπι[σ]κό[που]ς και μάρτυρας) [of his intentions] the divine *Augusti* (θεοὺς Σ[εβ]αστοὺς) and the ancestral gods (καὶ θε[οὺς πατρίου[ς]) . . ." (*IGRR* 4, 661 *l.* 22-23). Ignatius is an overseer (ἐπίσκοπος) who is not himself divine but a τύπος of the Father who is, and moreover a witness (μάρτυς) in the Christian sense of one who is to lay down his life, as a μιμητής of divine suffering.

The three Orders are τύποι or εἰκόνες that represent a community in process of redemption, and the saving acts of Father, Son, and Spirit at work in such a community. We shall now examine how their function in the Christian cult explicitly mirrors the religious objective of the Imperial Cult in securing the *pax deorum*.

Ἰσαυρί]ας Λυκα]ο[νίας πρ]οκαθεζ[ομένη. . . . Cf. *IGUR* 1, 78 and 80. Note furthermore that the normal word for "preside" is used when this sense is required as in *SEG* XXXV, 1106: . . . ἡ π]ροεστῶσα τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν θεὸς Ἄρτε[μις . . .

3.3. ὁμονοία, discors natura, ius augurium *and the* pax deorum

The saving acts, experienced by the community and embodied in the Eucharistic liturgy and in the clerical roles played, display Christ's victory to the demonic powers who are thereby shaken. "For whenever you assemble frequently (ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε), the powers of Satan are destroyed (καθαιροῦνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανᾶ), and his destruction is dissolved (καὶ λύεται ὁ ὄλεθρος αὐτοῦ) by the harmony of your faith (ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως)."[43] We shall now see how such concepts of a restored ὁμονοία effected through the representation of divine forces are paralleled in the Imperial Cult.

Augustus's cult had, according to the Decree of the Koinon of Asia initiating the Imperial Cult there in 9 B.C.,[44] set right a fallen social and political order if not a disturbed natural order:

> If not [the beginning of all things] in nature at least in the order of the useful (εἰ μὴ τῇ φύσει, τῷ δὲ χρησίμῳ) for even if there is nothing in a fallen condition and restored to a fortunate condition that he has set right (εἴ γε οὐδὲν οὐχὶ διαπεῖπτον καὶ εἰς ἀτυχὲς μεταβεβηκὸς σχῆμα ἀνώρθωσεν), he has given the whole world a different appearance (ἑτέραν τε ἔδωκεν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ὄψιν), which would [as a world] have gladly welcomed its destruction (ἥδιστα ἂν δεξάμενῳ φθοράν) had not for the common good fortune Caesar been born (εἰ μὴ τὸ κοινὸν πάντων εὐτύχημα ἐπεγεννήθη Καῖσαρ).
>
> lines 1-9

Certainly what Lucan described in his de-mythologised Stoic account of the Civil War as *discors natura* (διαπεῖπτον καὶ εἰς ἀτυχὲς μεταβεβηκὸς σχῆμα) needed an act of augury to set right (ἀνώρθωσεν).

According to Lucan (Figulus), a political solution would go hand in hand with a religious and cultic solution. The political chaos of the civil war some seventy years before Octavian was but a reflection of the mysterious cosmic chaos which was the result of the *ira deorum*. In *Pharsalia* 1, 589-590 we read of the monsters "which nature at variance with herself, had brought forth (*discors protulerat natura*)." But *discors natura* needed to be set right, even if the imagery of the gods requiring *pax* to be re-established was absent from his demythologized scheme. That *pax* will only come with a *dominus*

---

[43] *Ephes.* 13,1 cf. *Smyr.* 6,1.

[44] Ehrenberg and Jones no. 98, cf. also *OGIS* 458; *SEG* IV, 490. R.K. Sherk (ed. and trans.), Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus, in *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome*, 4, E. Badian and R. Sherk (eds.) (Cambridge: U.P. 1984), no. 101 pp. 124-127.

(*cum domino pax ista venit*). (670) Rome's freedom (*civili tantum iam libera bello*) (672) is but a reflection of cosmic disorder: it is but the civil war as a reflection of constellations straying from their courses (*cur signa meatus/ deseruere suos mundoque obscura feruntur?*). (664)

Furthermore, two sources indicate that Augustus saw the foundations of the Imperial Cult as inaugurating a golden age specifically by an act of augury that would set right the straying constellations and all other aspects of *discors natura*. According to Suetonius *Augustus* 7, the divine title of Augustus adopted by Octavian was closely connected with his augural function. Rather than call himself Romulus as founder of the city, he chose the name Augustus. The reason that Suetonius gives connects that title with the *ius augurium*.[45] Thus Suetonius regarded *Augustus* as synonymous with *augur* and *augurium*.

Dio Cassius, in a way that reflects the underlying theology of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, records the successful performance of the *augurium salutis*, the sacred ritual for securing salvation or safety, unsuccessful during the events of the First Triumvirate in 63 B.C. He claims: ". . . they even held the so-called *augurium salutis*, after a very long interval. For this of course is a kind of augury."[46] We therefore find in the imperial cult a religious reformation that accompanied Augustus's political revolution, in which the sacramental act securing the *pax deorum*, so unsuccessful under Republican magistrates, was achieved by Augustus.[47]

As both the decree of the Koinon of Asia, and the iconography of the

---

[45] Suetonius *Augustus* 7: ". . . because religious places which are consecrated by an 'augur's' ritual (*quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur*) are called 'august' (*augusta dicantur*) . . ."

[46] Dio Cassius, XXXVII, 24,1: ὥστε καὶ τὸ οἰώνισμα τὸ τῆς ὑγιείας ὠνομασμένον διὰ πάνυ πολλοῦ ποιῆσαι. τοῦτο δὲ δὴ μαντείας τις τρόπος ἐστί, cf. (Epitome) 51,4 where the Temple of Janus is opened because wars have ceased and he augurium salutis is now successfully celebrated.

[47] The iconography of the *Gemma Augusti* is a particularly cogent example of the significance of the *ius augurium* for Augustus, see J.R. Fears, The Theology of Victory at Rome, in *ANRW* 2,17,2 (1981), p. 810: "The iconography of the Gemma itself boldly proclaims this intimate connection of Capricorn and triumph, marking the felicitas and virtus of Augustus, which have brought about the restoration of the golden age for mankind. . . . Flanked by Roma and crowned by Fortuna, the emperor holds in his right hand the *lituus*, the medium through which the will of the gods is manifest in his person and the emblem of those auspices by which Tiberius has triumphed." See also Augustus, *Res Gest.* c. 7,2: "pontifex maximus, augur, XV virum sacris faciundis, VII virum epulonum, frater arvalis, sodalis Titius, fetialis fui."

Ara Pacis erected at the same time make clear, the *pax* thus achieved was of quite superhuman and even millennial proportions, with the produce of the earth depicted in miraculously large abundance.[48] The ancient augural quest for the *pax deorum* with dreams of a golden age of plenty and peace, with a single bringer of that age, after a century of destructive civil war. How, in the imperial mysteries, was the supernatural and millennial *pax*, once achieved by Augustus, to be continued sacramentally?

In the *pax Augusti*, we may say, in parody of Ignatius, "destruction is dissolved (λύεται ὁ ὄλεθρος) . . . in concord (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ)."[49] Ὁμονοία (*Concordia*) was one of the idealized personified Virtues celebrated in a distinctive cultus, but associated early with Augustus' own divinity as *Concordia Augusta*.[50] Imperial society, with the collective memory of several generations of destructive civil war, in greeting *pax et princeps*, would have concurred that "nothing is better than peace (οὐδέν ἐστιν ἄμεινον εἰρήνης), in which all war of earthly and heavenly things is abolished (ἐν ᾗ πᾶς πόλεμος καταργεῖται ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων)." (*Ephes.* 13,2) As we have seen, civil discord of "earthly things (ἐπιγείων)" went hand in hand with a *discors natura* supernaturally understood (ἐπουρανίων).

Thus Ignatius' version of the Christian cult, through its cultic act, brings to an end the ὄλεθρος of the cosmic powers and their destruction. That cultic act exhibited through its human icons or τύποι, and through the ἁγιοφόροι who attended them, Christ's victory and peace to the daemonic powers. Thus the Christian Cult parallels in its acts and purpose that of Augustus, whose augural act secured the *pax deorum*.

Ignatius' use of human persons to be τύποι of divine beings constitutes a radical development of the typology of Church Order, but it is never-

---

[48] E. Bianchi, *Ara Pacis Augustae*, (Rome: Fratelli Palombi 1994), pp. 13-16, cf. G. Koeppel, Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit, V, Ara Pacis Augustae, in *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 187 (1987), p. 102. Fishwick (1987), 1,1 p. 98 discusses the precise dating of the completion after its original "constitution" on 4.7.13 B.C. See also *ibid.*, pp. 203-206.

[49] *Ephes.* 13,2 cf. 4, 1-2; *Magn.* 15: ἔρρωσθε ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεοῦ, κεκτημένοι ἀδιάκριτον πνεῦμα, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. In *Magn.* 6,2 ὁμοήθειαν θεοῦ is achieved by being united with the bishop in the threefold Order (ἑνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις . . .). See also *Tral.* 12,2; *Philad.* inscr. and 11.

[50] J.R. Fears, The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology, in *ANRW* 2,17,2 (1981), p. 886: "The cult epithet *Augusta*, attached to Pax, Justitia, Concordia, and Providentia, expressed the quintessence of the personalization of the cult of Virtues at Rome." See also *idem*, pp. 889-892.

theless a kind of reverse reflection of the typology of the Imperial Cult. Let us consider a further, literary example.

3.4. *Domitian's* corona aurea *and Ignatian* τύποι

Suetonius' account of the *corona aurea*, introduced by Domitian, implied a pagan iconographic theology. He wore a specially designed *corona aurea* in connection with his alterations in the cult of Jupiter Capitolinus designed to adapt this to the imperial cult. The *corona aurea* that he wore at the institution of quinquennial contests for this cult was impressed with "an image of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva (*coronam auream cum effigie Iovis ac Iunonis Minervaeque*)." However, the priest of Jupiter and the college of Flaviales assisting him in the ceremonial also wore (*pari habitu*) crowns with images of these three deities, but included, in addition, Domitian's own image (*nisi quod illorum coronis inerat et ipsius imago*).[51]

We see in the *effigies* or *imago* on the *corona aurea*, worn by the *Pontifex Maximus* of the imperial cult, a sacramental representation of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. These deities are made sacramentally present by the cultic acts of Domitian as *Pontifex Maximus*, just as in *Magn.* 13,1 the Father, Son, and spirit-filled "circle" or "crown" of the apostles are made sacramentally present by the τύποι (*imago, effigies*) of bishops, presbyters, and deacons (μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιοπρεπεστάτου ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν καὶ ἀξιοπλόκου πνευματικοῦ στεφάνου τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ θεὸν διακόνων). The bishop represents God the Father, with whom the spirit-filled apostles are united in the presbyters and the Son in the deacons. Likewise Domitian, *dominus et deus*, is made sacramentally present in all priests of the imperial cult, who wear his image on their crowns, and unite their individual acts into his one cultic act.

We have already referred to the μυστικὸς ἀγών at the temples of Roma and Augustus at Pergamon in which the σεβαστοφάντης displayed the image of the Emperor as the climax to the mystery play. Here the εἰκών as a statue or τύπος (*effigies*) on a crown can be said to make the imperial genius or τύχη sacramentally present. Likewise in Ignatius' picture of the Eucharistic assembly, the saving figures of Father, Spirit filled Apostles, and Son are made sacramentally present by the liturgical drama enacted by bishop, presbyters and deacons, of which they are the τύποι. We have moreover in Herodian V, 5,6-7 an account of the acclamation of the Senate and their act of sacrifice before Heliogabalus (A.D. 218), in which the emperor's εἰκών is associated with the τύπος τοῦ ἐπιχωρίου θεοῦ:

---

[51] Suetonius. *Domit.* 4.

> ... having had painted a great, full-sized representation of himself (εἰκόνα μεγίστην γράψας παντὸς ἑαυτοῦ), in which he appeared reaching forward and performing sacrifice (οἷος προϊών τε καὶ ἱερουργῶν ἐφαίνετο), and having placed in the picture the form of the god of the country (παραστήσας τε ἐν τῇ γραφῇ τὸν τύπον τοῦ ἐπιχωρίου θεοῦ) with whom of course he was depicted as obtaining good omens (ᾧ δὴ καλλιερῶν ἐγέγραπτο), and having sent it to Rome, he ordered the image to be hung up in the exact centre of the senate house and in the highest spot (ἐκέλευσεν ἐν τῷ μεσαιτάτῳ τῆς συγκλήτου τόπῳ ὑψηλοτάτῳ τε τὴν εἰκόνα ἀνατεθῆναι), over the head of the statue of Victory (ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τοῦ ἀγάλματος τῆς Νίκης), so that when they assembled in council (ὡς συνιόντες ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον) they each would burn incense (λιβανωτόν τε θυμιῶσιν ἕκαστος) and pour libations of wine (καὶ οἴνους σπένδουσι).

Here clearly the εἰκών of the emperor is associated with the τύπος of the θεός ἐπιχωρίος which it mediates from the centre of the Senate gathered for its business as the centre of its unity, just as Ignatius' bishop stands at the centre of the Eucharistic assembly as the τύπος πατρός.

But as we have noted, Ignatius is an ἐπίσκοπος who is not himself divine but a τύπος of the suffering Father God and whose role he plays in the Christian ἀγὼν μυστικός. He was in his cultic procession a witness (μάρτυς) in the Christian sense of one who is to lay down his life, as a μιμητής of divine suffering, to which spectacle of bloody sacrifice the Ephesians could react with the enflamed passions of arena spectators (*Ephes.* 1,1).

At this point the iconography of ecclesial Order merges into both the iconography of martyrdom and of a cultic procession. Let us now examine the particular ambassadorial titles given to various clerics who accompany Ignatius's procession in order to establish their equivalents with those officials appointed by the city states of Asia in order to secure inauguration and celebration of a new Imperial Cult.

4. *The role of the* πρεσβεία *in the martyr-procession*

It is important for us to begin by noting the connection between the carrying of sacred τύποι and embassies from various cities to Rome. Ignatius' role as the martyr bishop is linked in his consciousness, as we have shown (section 3), with the pagan concept of a θεοφόρος in a pagan mystery process. Likewise his role as προκαθημένος εἰς τύπον πατρός is linked with the prominent or pre-eminent statuary of pagan τύποι of the gods in their cities (3.2). But such τύποι played a role not only in pagan mysteries, examples of which came to be associated with the Imperial Cult, but also in ambassadorial processions.

Robert points out the way in which small statues (ἱερώματα or ἀγαλμά-

τια) were carried by individuals and groups such as merchants in their clothing.[52] Furthermore, he notes that these small idols were described by Josephus, with reference to Rachel's idols in *Gen.* 31,31-35, as τύποι.[53] Furthermore, the purpose of such ornaments were not simply general individual devotion or ἀποτροπή. There were "éléments d'un laraire portatif" in groups that carried images of their common protecting gods. The Alexandrine *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* describe two embassies, Alexandrian and Jewish, the former of which has as their spokesman Hermaiscus, who argued their respective cases before the tribunal of Trajan.[54] Regarding the Alexandrians, it is recorded that they were: ἕκαστοι βαστάζοντες τοὺς ἰδίους θεούς (*l.* 17-18). Furthermore βαστάζειν is a technical term meaning "to carry in a procession." "The bust of Sarapis (Σαράπιδος προτομή) which the ambassadors were carrying (ἣν ἐβάσταζον οἱ πρέσβεις) suddenly began sweating (αἰφνίδιον ἵδρωσεν)," and the miracle caused consternation (*l.* 51-55).

We have furthermore the epigraphical remains of a letter of Caracalla to Ephesus (A.D. 200-205). In one part of the inscription separate from the main body of the letter we have Caracalla's comments on the members of the embassy who have presented their city's congratulations to the emperor on his victory over the Parthians. When he says: [ἃ δὲ π]ροεπρέσβευεν ἡ πάτριος ὑμῶν θεὸς Ἄρτεμις, he means that "your ancestral goddess Artemis heads the embassy" because her image is literally carried at the embassy's head. To parallel Ignatian usage, we may say that, in the ambassadorial procession, the τύπος τῆς ὑμῶν θεοῦ Ἀρτέμιδος is "pre-eminent (προκαθημένος)," just as in Ignatius' martyr procession, as in his Christian cult, the bishop is προκαθημένος εἰς τύπον θεοῦ ὑμῶν. Just as in the *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* the τύπος of Serapis caused wonder at Rome by the miracle that it produced, so too Ignatius, who bears the τύπος of the suffering God, will in the arena confront Rome's power as the bishop from the East confronts the Emperor from the West (section 1).

But the concept of πρεσβεία is related to Ignatius' imperial background in other and more general ways than the bearing of images alone. The election of deacons as ambassadors in *Philadelphians* and *Smyrnaeans* was

---

[52] L. Robert, Le Serpent Glycon d'Abônouteichos à Athénes et Artémis d'Éphèse à Rome, in *Opera Minora Selecta: Épigraphie et Antiquités Grecques*, tome V (Amsterdam: Hakkert 1989), pp. 747-769 (= *CRAI* (1981)), pp. 519-535.

[53] Josephus, *Antiquitates*, I,9,10 (= 322): Ῥαχήλα πυνθανομένη κατατίθησι τοὺς τύπους εἰς τὴν σάγην τῆς φερούσης αὐτὴν καμήλου, see Robert (1981), p. 519 (= (1989), p. 753).

[54] Robert (1981), pp. 530-531 (= (1989), pp. 764-765); H.A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs, Acta Alexandrinorum* (New York: Arno Press 1979), 8, pp. 44-48.

related to the situation in Ignatius' Church of Antioch in Syria. Undoubtedly, and at very least, such elections of delegations from the leaders of communities was a general feature of the formal relations between the city states in Asia Minor and can be understood by analogy with such civic relations.[55] But what was the purpose of this embassy and what sense can be made of it against such a contemporary background?

I believe Schoedel to be correct in identifying a divided Christian community at Antioch which has found peace, rather than a Church persecuted externally.[56] We may note from the example of Clement *Cor.* that such an external threat may follow, not in terms of a general persecution, but from the civil consequences from internal divisions for a community divided by internal strife and the need for the authorities to intervene. But there is still a problem regarding the purpose and meaning of the election and sending of these clerical ambassadors even on the view that strife had given way to peace within a divided Christian community.

Why should Ignatius have considered it necessary to send representatives whose office he conceived in terms of ambassadors in order to rejoice with them in the gathered Eucharistic assembly? Ambassadors were usually sent to confer some benefit or mark of regard, in particular upon the emperor in connection with his cult. Ignatius considers the imperial virtues of ὁμονοία and εἰρήνη as essential features of any Christian community that by its very nature will be marked by the threefold hierarchy.[57] These were also the divine qualities associated with Augustus' act of augury and continued sacramentally in his cult, as we have shown.

I propose, therefore, that we should understand references to a clerical πρεσβεία in the Ignatian letters in the light of the πρέσβεις associated with the inscriptions of the Imperial Cult.

We have the decree of the People (δῆμος) and Council (γερουσία) of Sardis honouring Menogenes son of Isidorus. He was to become priest of Roma and Augustus shortly after his selection as an ambassador on an embassy to Augustus, to seek approval for the consecration of a day commemorating his grandson Gaius' assumption of the *toga praetextata.* Here the usual provisions for an imperial cultic celebration are prescribed.

---

[55] Thus Schoedel (1985), p. 213.

[56] Schoedel (1985), pp. 10-12, 248-251.

[57] εὐταξία for the possession of which Onesimus, bishop of Ephesus, praises his congregation (*Ephes.* 6,5); cf. Clement *Cor.* 37,2; 40,1.

> . . . all in resplendent clothes shall wear crowns (ἐν λαμπραῖς ἐσθῆσιν στεφανηφορεῖν ἅπαντας), and the annual *strategoi* shall present sacrifices to the gods (θ[υ]σίας τε παριστάναι τοῖς θεοῖς τοὺς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν στρατηγοὺς) and make prayers through the sacred heralds for his safety (καὶ κατευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι διὰ τῶν ἱεροκηρύκων ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ), and they shall set up and consecrate his statue in the shrine of his father (συνκαθιερῶσαί τε ἄγαλμα αὐτοῦ τῷ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐνιδρύοντας ναῷ) . . . and an embassy be sent on these matters to go to Rome (πρεσβήαν τε ὑπὲρ τούτων στεῖλαι τὴν ἀφιξομένην εἰς Ῥώμην) and to greet him and Augustus (καὶ συνχαρησομένην αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ Σε[β]αστῷ) . . . and there were chosen as ambassadors (καὶ ᾑρέθησαν πρέσβεις) Iollus son of Metrodorus and Menogenes son of Isidorus . . .
>
> *IGRR* 4, 1756 I, *l.* 10-23

Following the cultic provisions, πρέσβεις are therefore duly appointed, whose function is to take the provisions for the extension of the Imperial Cult to Rome for the approval of those whom the cult honours. "Emperor Caesar son of God, Augustus, high priest . . ." replies in approval (*IGRR* 4, 1756 II).

The πρέσβεις function therefore as proclaimers of the cult, who convey its benefits to their fellow-citizens. A similar idea surrounds Ignatius' cultic procession which proclaims as a counter-culture arising from the East the reverse image of the imperial cult of the West as it arrives at the latter's arena of sacrifice. This is why he will also change the names of civic officials to give them a Christian meaning, as when he calls a πρεσβύτης a θεοπρεσβύτης, or a ἡμεροδρόμος a θεοδρόμος.

Furthermore there is epigraphical evidence of πρέσβεις who accompanied the emperor. These θεορπεσβύται should therefore return and accompany the martyr-bishop from the East, as the counterpart to the emperor and his cult in the West. Πρεσβευταί clearly accompany the emperor Julius Caesar in *Syll.*[3] 761 where Callistus of Knidos (48/47 B.C.) is described as "coming to Greece (γενόμενος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος) in the company of the emperor (μ[ετὰ τοῦ αὐτοκρ]άτορος) and in the company of his ambassadors (καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐκείνου πρεσβευτῶν)."

We can see how the communities who support Ignatius' procession enlarge it by sending their own πρεσβεία to join it. To the Philadelphians he says:

> . . . since according to your prayer (ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τὴν προσευχὴν ὑμῶν) . . . it has been announced (ἀπηγγέλη μοι) to me that the Church in Antioch in Syria is at peace (εἰρηνεύειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας), it is fitting for you (πρέπον ἐστὶν ὑμῖν) as a church of God (ὡς ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ) to elect a deacon to conduct God's embassy there (χειροτονῆσαι διάκονον εἰς τὸ

> πρεσβεῦσαι ἐκεῖ θεοῦ πρεσβείαν), in order to rejoice with them when assembled (εἰς τὸ συγχαρῆναι αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γενομενοῖς) and to glorify the name (καὶ δοξάσαι τὸ ὄνομα) . . .
>
> *Philad.* 10,1

Though Ignatius mentions that it is a deacon who acts as a πρεσβύτης (πρεσβεῦσαι) here, he goes on to assert that such an office can be also exercised by bishops and presbyters.[58]

Thus the ἐκκλησία θεοῦ in Philadelphia sent an elected deacon as an ambassador and no doubt welcomed him on his return and received his report (ἀποπρεσβεία). Similarly Menogenes, on his return to the civic ἐκκλησία in Sardis, made his ἀποπρεσβεία or ambassador's report to a full-session of the gathered community.[59] Like the embassy (πρεσβείαν) of Menogenes, that would travel to Rome and rejoice with Gaius and Augustus (τὴν ἀφιξομένην εἰς Ῥώμην καὶ συγχαρησομένην αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ Σεβαστῷ), so too this deacon as ambassador is to rejoice with the gathered Church in Antioch (εἰς τὸ συγχαρῆναι αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γενομενοῖς). This deacon however will not proclaim the cult of Augustus and sacrifices for Gaius' birthday, but rather the progress of the martyr's procession. They are "to glorify the name (καὶ δοξάσαι τὸ ὄνομα)" of Christ which is associated with both Ignatius' martyrdom and the peace of Christ's sacrifice of which that martyrdom is an image or τύπος.

Ignatius informs those who are "inflamed by the blood of God (ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ)." That it is "for the common name (ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ὀνόματος)" that he goes bound (δεδεμένον) to the arena (θηριομαχῆσαι). "To suffer reproach for the name (ὀνειδίζεσθαι)" is a common martyrological sentiment (1 *Pet.* 4,14). But here it is qualified by the adjective κοινός and indicates that what he does is shared in common with all those churches through which his procession passes and which respond to his *appellatio.*

Κοινόν was, after all, the name of the "Commonwealth of Asia" (Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας) that organised a provincial Imperial Cult and elected an *archiereus*/ asiarch. Menogenes is approved because he "acted also as an ambassador (πρεσβεύσας τε καὶ) to Caesar Augustus (πρὸς τὸν Σεβαστὸν Καίσαρα) on behalf of the Koinon of Asia (ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων)."[60] Just as the object

---

[58] *Philad.* 10,2: ὡς καὶ αἱ ἔγγιστα ἐκκλησίαι ἔπεμψαν ἐπισκόπους, αἱ δὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους.

[59] *IGRR* 4, 1756 III *l.* 35-36: παραγενόμενός τε ἐν τῇ συναχθείσῃ δημοτελεῖ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὴν ἀποπρεσβείαν ἐποιεῖτο.

[60] *IGRR* 4, 1756, X *l.* 104.

of that cult was the *pax deorum*, so too Ignatius' cultic procession is involved with securing the *pax Christi*, and its ambassadors are concerned with that end. What "has been announced (ἀπηγγέλη μοι) to me," just as the glad tidings were announced (εὐαγγελίσθη) at Sardis of Gaius' celebration,[61] was that the Church in Antioch in Syria is at peace (εἰρηνεύειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Αντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας). Furthermore, that peace was in accordance with the congregation's prayer (κατὰ τὴν προσευχὴν ὑμῶν), just as the prayers (κατευχάς) through the sacred heralds (διὰ τῶν ἱεροκηρύκων) at Sardis were for Gaius' safety (ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτου).

Smyr. 11,2, contains similar sentiments regarding the appointment of an ambassador to *Philad.* 10,1. The person that "your church is to appoint for the honour of God (εἰς τιμὴν θεοῦ χειροτονῆσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑμῶν)" is here called "God's ambassador (θεοπρεσβύτην)," a combined expression indicative of some office in view. "To rejoice with (συγχαρῆναι)" the church of Antioch at peace (ὅτι εἰρηνεύουσιν) is also the purpose of the Smyrnaean θεοπρεσβύτης as it had been of the Philadelphian diaconal πρεσβεία. But this passage adds two features important for our discussion.

The first is that the character of that peace is defined. It is clearly a peace between members of a body politic. "Being at peace (εἰρηνεύουσιν)" means that "they have recovered their proper size (ἀπέλαβον τὸ ἴδιον μέγεθος) and their proper corporateness (τὸ ἴδιον σωματεῖον) has been restored (ἀπεκατεστάθη αὐτοῖς)." These lines emphasize once again how important to the community is what brings peace.

The second is that it is his martyr's bonds that produce the prayer of the Christian cult that achieves this restoration of corporateness. It is the martyr in chains (δέσμα) whose ἀντιψύχον (*Smyr.* 10,2; *Pol.* 2,6) is being prepared for the ready altar at Rome, and who is the victim occupying the central place in the procession that mediates through their prayer the peace of the Antiochene community. The prayer realising that end is to be accompanied by the appointment of a godly ambassador to complete it by an embassy that will go there to proclaim it:

> Your prayer went out (ἡ προσευχὴ ὑμῶν ἀπῆλθεν) to the church of Antioch in Syria (ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν 'Αντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας), from whence bound with divinely glorious chains I salute all (ὅθεν δεδεμένος θεοπρεπεστάτοις δεσμοῖς πάντας ἀσπάζομαι) . . . so then, that your work may be completed both on earth and in heaven (ἵνα οὖν τέλειον ὑμῶν γένηται τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ) . . . appoint a godly ambassador . . . etc.

---

[61] Ehrenberg and Jones no. 99 = I. *Sardis* 7,1,8, *l.* 12-14; Price (1984), p. 66 and p. 259 cat. no. 56.

The reference here to ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ reinforces the cosmic and cultic context of Ignatius' martyr-procession.

In his letter to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, Ignatius requests the election (χειροτονῆσαι) "of someone (τινα) . . . who can be called "God's runner (ὅς δυνήσεται θεοδρόμος καλεῖσθαι)." In order to appoint a θεοδρόμος, Polycarp is instructed "to summon a god-pleasing council (συμβούλιον ἀγαγεῖν θεοπρεπέστατον)."[62] (*Pol.* 7,2) It seems that Ignatius here is providing in the function of θεοδρόμος, a Christian version of the ἡμεροδρόμος.[63] This term refers to a very fast runner or courier, who because of imperial business was allowed to use the *cursus publicus* (δρόμος δημόσιος).[64] Ignatius' companions were allowed to use the *cursus publicus* in his case as they were accompanying an official party with a prisoner in chains. It is therefore a further corroboration of Ignatius' triumphalism that he reassigns those who accompany him in the role of a condemned criminal's friends, to that of the official entourage of the bishop from the East rising like the sun against the Emperor from the West.

In *Philad.* 2,2 this term appears again, with reference to false teachers who have tried to take the θεοδρόμοι captives (τοὺς θεοδρόμους αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν), no doubt in a figurative sense, and so impede the progress of the martyr-procession. They are "many plausible wolves (πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι)," guided "by evil pleasure (ἡδονῇ κακῇ)." Clearly "these will have no place in your unity (ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ἑνότητι ὑμῶν οὐχ ἕξουσιν τόπον)," that is

---

[62] In *IGRR* 4, 1756 II *l.* 32-33 Menogenes "completed (ἐτέλεσε) his most well pleasing embassy (τὴν πρεσβήαν εὐπρεπέστατα) worthily of the city (ἀξίως τῆς πόλεως)."

[63] Zahn's view (*Ignatius* p. 286 note 3), contradicted in Schoedel (1985), p. 278, would seem to be correct in view of the civic background in the city-states of Asia Minor that I have sketched here for both Ignatius and the *Apocalypse*. I cannot see why the use of θεοδρόμοι in *Philad.* 2,2 should deny that view since here the term is not used, as Schoedel says, "to Christians in general," but to members of the Ignatian cultic procession which the particular churches to which he writes have undertaken both in spirit and through representatives to join.

[64] For ἡμεροδρόμος see *SEG* XLII 1745 = *Syll.*[3] 303 cf. Pausanias VI, 16,5 = Menacles of Elis. . . . ἡμεροδρόμος of Alexander son of Philip. See also Livy 31, 24: hemerodromos vocant Graeci ingens die uno cursu emetientes spatium. For their connection with the *cursus publicus* in imperial times, see H. Stephan, Das Verkehrsleben im Alterthum, in *Historisches Taschenbuch* (Ed. F. von Raumer) 9,4 (Leipzig: Brockhaus 1868), p. 93: "Der cursus publicus war nicht für jedermann benutzbar; es bestand kein regelmässiger, fortlaufender Postengang mit vorher festgesetzten Abgangs-, Ankunfts- und Beförderungszeiten; vielmehr fand die Beförderung nur statt, wenn gerade Depeschen oder Reisenden vorkamen . . ."

the unity of nascent episcopal Order being reinforced by the procession of the martyr-bishop of Antioch and effecting peace in his home Church. Indeed they are like highway robbers attacking the bishop whose legitimacy is vindicated in his martyr sacrifice as τύπος of the suffering God.

5. *In conclusion*

Commentators such as Schoedel (1985) have drawn parallels between religious and political ideas in the city states of Asia Minor and the Ignatian correspondence. General allusions to the language of the mystery cults have been to a lesser or greater degree drawn by others, as well as to the nomenclature for civic office-holders. Pleket's work (1965), and more recently Price (1984) and Fishwick (1987), on the specific relationship between mystery rites and the Imperial Cult have enabled us to specify more precisely the origins of the parallel Ignatian concepts. The identification of that parallelism has, moreover, been considerably strengthened by the recognition of Ignatius's self-conscious comparison between his cultic procession, and that of the Roman Empire. What has finally clearly emerged is a contracultural pattern in the development of early Christian Church Order which has formed itself as a kind of reverse mirror image of Imperial Order.

University College of St. Mark and St. John, *Plymouth*, U.K.

EUNOMIUS OF CYZICUS AND GREGORY OF NYSSA: TWO TRADITIONS OF TRANSCENDENT CAUSALITY[1]

BY

MICHEL RENÉ BARNES

For most of this century scholarly investigation of the influence of philosophy, particularly cosmology, on trinitarian doctrine in the fourth century has been functionally equivalent to the search for the origins of fourth century trinitarian heterodoxy. On the one hand, many traditional accounts of the controversies accepted the old polemically-motivated characterization of anti-Nicenes as virtual Pagan wolves in Christian sheepskins; on the other hand, many modern accounts of the development of doctrine have used the newer but no less polemically motivated thesis of "the problematic of hellenization" to enlarge the category of heterodoxy to include basically everyone in the fourth century except, perhaps, Athanasius. Even those scholars who offered fresh reconsiderations of anti-Nicenes like Arius, such as Maurice Wiles in his ground-breaking "In Defence of Arius,"[2] nonetheless sought to defend Arius by bracketing off the influence of hellenistic cosmology. This tactic is well dramatized in the later work by Robert Gregg and Dennis Groh, where one major source of Christian cosmological speculation for both anti- and pro-Nicenes (but especially for anti-Nicenes), namely Eusebius of Caesarea, simply does not appear.[3] As we move through a scholarly synthesis (in the Hegelian sense) of the earlier opposing positions on the corrupting influence of philosophy, we now

[1] An earlier draft of this article was presented as a paper at the Midwest Patristic Seminar, University of Chicago, February, 1993.

[2] "In Defence of Arius," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII (1962), 339-47.

[3] *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981). For a more developed and sympathetic discussion of the significance of Eusebius' cosmology in his theology and for the theology of the fourth century, see L. Rebecca Lyman's recent *Christology and Cosmology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 82-123. My approach differs from Lyman's by working from the specific or technical senses of power (*dynamis*).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

find, for example, Rowan Williams[4] and Maurice Wiles[5] agreeing in recent publications (written at almost the same time) that cosmological interests indeed shaped the thought of all sides and provided much of the language by which all Christians of the fourth century conceived and expressed their own doctrines.

What I will say here about the role of alternative causal language in the competing trinitarian theologies of Eunomius of Cyzicus and Gregory of Nyssa goes a bit further than this recent happy synthesis. I will argue that we can understand fundamental differences between the trinitarian doctrines of Gregory and Eunomius through a recognition of their different accounts of transcendent causality. In particular I will argue that Gregory and Eunomius develop their own distinctive theologies by drawing upon alternative transcendental causalities already available in school platonism. By "transcendental causalities" I mean specific accounts of the character of causality associated with the first or highest member of a transcendent hierarchy. A significant example of what I mean by "transcendental causality" is the account of the Good in the *Republic* 508-509. Although scholarly attention tends to settle on the famous statement that the Good is beyond being, the passage itself is a treatise on how, exactly, the Good is a cause. The statement that the Good is beyond being is couched in the conclusion that the Good is not lacking in power or dignity, two attributes which refer to medical and political aetiologies introduced earlier in the dialogue. The point of Plato's argument in *Republic* 508-509 is that the Good is not beyond being a cause, even if it is beyond "οὐσία." The very causalities suggested by δύναμις and πρεσβεία are the two kinds of causalities that will come into play in the differences between Gregory and Eunomius. On the one hand, Eunomius' account of divine productivity is expressed in moral or political language like ἐξουσία, βουλή, and πρόσταγμα; potentially overdetermined language like δύναμις or ἐνέργεια (hereafter transliterated by *dynamis* or *energeia*) are used only in the moral or political sense. Gregory's account of divine productivity is, on the other hand, expressed in the language of connatural union, with terms like συμφυές or φυσικὴ ἰδιότης, which are both considered to be interchangeable with *dynamis*. Is then the first existent productive by nature or may productive causality

[4] See the chapters in section four of Rowan Williams' *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1987).

[5] "The Philosophy in Christianity: Arius and Athanasius," in *The Philosophy in Christianity*, Godfrey Vesey, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 41-52.

be delegated entirely to a first and mediating product, such that the first existent is not intrinsically productive? Is the Good a cause the way Xerxes in his palace collects taxes and commands his armies (as is the case in Ps. Aristotle's *On the Cosmos*), or is the Good a cause the way fire is hot or the eye sees (as is the case for Plotinus)?

These kinds of argument, and this division of language, make sense to Eunomius and Gregory because they both share the following understandings. They agree that the kind of unity that holds between the divine nature and divine productivity determines the kind of unity that holds between the First and Second Persons because the act of generation or production is the act through which the product's nature is determined. If God's productive capacity is not inherent in His nature then a common nature cannot be communicated to the product. Eunomius and Gregory also agree that statements on the status of God's productive capacity are dramatized in doctrines of the Son as the creator God—they also share the understanding that the Son is the creator. Eunomius believes that the moral, non-natural unity between God and his creative capacity is dramatized in the Son's reception of the delegated capacity to create; Gregory believes that the Son's capacity to create reveals the common power or faculty and thus the common nature the Son shares with the Father, given that the capacity to create is not something that can stand apart from the divine nature. Eunomius is thus led to emphasize God's transcendence over-against not only the Son but also over-against the capacity to produce the Son, while Gregory is led to emphasize the transcendence of the divine productive capacity in common with the divine nature, so to ensure the fully natural, fully transcendent source of the Son and thus His own transcendent nature. Eunomius' theology leads him to take creation as the fundamental term for divine production to the point where Eunomius will describe the Son himself as created, while Gregory's theology leads him to take generation as the fundamental term for divine production, even to the point where Gregory will describe creation as one sense of generation.

The Role of Causal Language in Trinitarian Doctrine

The role of causal or productive language in trinitarian doctrine has its beginnings at least in the scriptural language of father and son. If it is true that analytical language such as *logos*, *doxa* or *sophia* does not seem necessarily to require a causal relationship between that which has, for example, a *logos* and that *logos* itself, it is also true that in the early common

era, Pagans, Jews and Christians equally and consistently interpret such analytical relationships as causal. The most influential of the early Christians to make a causal description of the relationship between the first and second persons central to trinitarian doctrine is Origen. In *On First Principles* I.2, Origen offers a detailed account of how the Son comes to be from God based upon an extended exegesis of Wisdom 7:25, Hebrews 1:3, and 1 Cor. 1:24. Wisdom 7:25 and Hebrews 1:3 both describe the relationship between God and his Wisdom or Power in generative terms; the straight-forward analytical description of Christ as the "Power and Wisdom of God" in 1 Cor. 1:24 is subsumed by Origen under the causal relationships described in Wisdom 7:25. Both Eunomius and Gregory accept Origen's insight that any doctrine of the Trinity presumes an account of divine causality; their different doctrines of the unity of the Trinity are argued on the basis of different doctrines of divine productivity.

For Eunomius the transcendence of God requires that He cannot be understood to generate a product which has the same kind of existence He has, since that kind of existence is to be uncaused or unproduced, and any product will necessarily (i.e., by definition) be caused.[6] The uniqueness of God's kind of existence means that any productivity must exist outside His nature. Any suggestion that God was, in His essence, a cause posed problems for Eunomius' conception of divine transcendence; hence he placed great emphasis on the very limited way in which a productive causality could be directly attributed to God.[7] According to Eunomius, God's productive capacity can only be that of an activity, *energeia*, which is external to the essence.[8] This external productive activity is that of creating, the only sort of divine production that Eunomius recognizes. God's own activity of creating is limited to the production of the second Person; the second Person creates everything else.[9] Eunomius distinguished the created nature of the Son from other created natures by describing the Son as the unique product of God's own activity, while everything else was created by the activity of the Son.[10] Eunomius develops his theological hierarchy through technical causal language of *physis/ousia*, *energeia*, and *erga* which is available to him from several sources.[11] Eunomius understood

---

[6] *Apology* 10:1-4. See Richard P. Vaggione's edition with translation, *Eunomius: the Extant Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), hereafter cited as *Extant Works*.

[7] *Apology* 9:1-3; 16:1-17:6.

[8] *Apology* 22:7-12; 23:4-16.

[9] *Apology* 17:10-12.

[10] *Apology* 15:14-16; 28:6-8.

[11] *Apology* 23:4 ff. For the different sources of this language, see my "The Background

God's causal activity to be separate from His essence because it is an activity of His free will, while an essential causality would subvert both the ideas of God's simplicity and God's freedom.[12]

The Son as Demiurge

Eunomius' earliest discussion of the notion of productive capacity is in chapters 15 and 16 of the *Apology*, written in the early 360's. He begins chapter 15 by eliminating inappropriate notions of divine productivity, namely, begetting, partition, and the addition of form to a formless substrate or matter, and he then speaks of the unique nature of the Son.[13] There for the first time in the *Apology*, Eunomius suggests God's will (γνώμη) as the productive source of the Son.

Eunomius does use *dynamis* to name productive capacities in God and in the Son: the Son has the "demiurgic power" through which God creates,[14] for the Son alone was created, and created directly, by the power of God.[15] The first use of *dynamis* in the *Apology* is in the phrase δημιουργικῆς δυνάμεως as it is applied to the Son to explain his creative role and capacity: all things are made through him, for the creative capacity was begotten in him.[16] *Dynamis* next appears to describe the Son's unique source, which qualifies him to be the "perfect minister of the creative activity and intention of the Father."[17] In each occurrence *dynamis* is used of the demiurgic capacity, which is Eunomius' term for the creative capacity. It is the notion of *demiurge*, whether expressed as noun, adjective, or verb, which is

---

and Use of Eunomius' Causal Language," *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, eds. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), pp. 217-236.

[12] *Apology* 17-18.

[13] *Apology* 15:9-10, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53. However, Eunomius does not immediately follow up the reference to the will; he does say that the Son's origin is unique, or rather, that the Son is the unique product of this originating source. *Apology* 15:9-11, *ibid.*, pp. 52-53. Later, of course, Eunomius will make it clear that this originating source is God's will or activity: see *Apology* 24:1-4, *ibid.*, pp. 65-64.

[14] *Apology* 15:13, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53.

[15] *Apology* 15:14, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53.

[16] *Apology* 15:11-13, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53: "For we acknowledge, in conformity with the blessed John, that 'all things were made through him,' since the creative power was begotten coexistentially in him from above. . . ."

[17] *Apology* 15:14-16, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53, which continues, "Since he alone was begotten and created by the power of the Unbegotten, he became the perfect minister of the whole creative activity and purpose of the Father."

the central notion for Eunomius in this description of divine productivity.[18] The reason why *dynamis* is used here at all is that demiurgic power are two words used together idiomatically as one term.[19] Eunomius uses, indeed

---

[18] *Apology* 16:1-6, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53.

[19] I cannot agree with those scholars who find Eunomius' use of *dynamis* here—or at *Apology* 19:8-19, where Eunomius distinguishes the sense of the titles "light," "life," "power" as applied to God and to the Son—as evidence of the influence of 1 Cor. 1:24 (a text normally associated with pro-Nicene theology) on Eunomius; see, e.g., *Extant Works*, pp. 56, apparatus, and 174. Vaggione nuances this opinion with the proviso that ". . . there is no . . . entirely certain use of 1 Cor. 1:24," p. 174, in the works of Eunomius, but this does not stop him from finding at least three references to 1 Cor. 1:24 by Eunomius. I see no convincing reason to take this step. References to *dynamis* alone may be taken from any number of sources, credal as well as scriptural. An alternate source for the use of *dynamis* which must be considered is provided by Wolfram Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck, 1990), pp. 128-129, who argues that, despite the disputed exegesis of 1 Cor. 1:24 at Nicaea, Asterius' doctrine of the Son as *dynamis* is based on Romans 1:20. The Romans text itself, Asterius' exegesis of it, or the many non-Nicene creeds using *dynamis* in anti-Marcellan doxologies, are all possible sources for Eunomius' use of the single title, "*dynamis*."

Vaggione also cites a passage from the *Second Apology* to support his discovery of 1 Cor. 1:24: in *Against Eunomius* III:1, at II 10:25-11:8 of the *Contra Eunomium Libri*, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (hereafter GNO), Werner Jaeger, ed., vols. I and II (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), Gregory suggests that Eunomius appealed to Prov. 8:22, which was understood to apply to the Son because Paul refers to the second Person as Wisdom. The Pauline reference is understood (by the GNO editor) to be to 1 Cor. 1:24. However, Gregory's citation makes no mention of power, and 1 Cor. 1:24 is suggested by the presence of "Wisdom" language, not any mention of power. It is also not clear that the reference to the Pauline passage occurred in the original *Second Apology* use of Prov. 8:22; Gregory gives the Pauline background as an explanation of the reasoning by "champions of heresy."

There remains only the very cryptic Syriac fragment: "The Father <created> only the Son, and the Son the Holy Spirit—indeed, he (the Father) poured the whole power of God into the Son, for he is the 'power and the wisdom of God.'" *Extant Works*, p. 179. The fragment seems to be a re-statement of the recognizably Eunomian doctrine that the Son is the creator of the Holy Spirit, in which the capacity to create is described as a power given to the Son by God. What is unique to the Syriac fragment is the conclusion that by the reception of this power of God the Son also receives the title "Power of God," a Asterian-sounding conclusion which nowhere appears in the *Apology*.

I must also take exception with the recent opinion expressed by David Runia that "The notion of *dynamis* frequently occurs in the remains of Eunomius [Runia here cites Vaggione] . . ., and 1 Cor. 1:24 is one of his favorite texts." *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993), p. 246, n. 55. The ambiguity I noted above in Vaggione's remarks in *Extant Works*, p. 174, has here led Runia astray: *dynamis* occurs

emphasizes, *dynamis* in this context because the doctrine of the Son acting as creator through the reception of a delegated power is a traditional way of subordinating the Son to God (the Father). The same association of *dynamis* with *demiurge* is found, for example, in the theology of Eusebius of Caesarea. A typical example of this association occurs in *Demonstration of the Gospel*:

> . . . there is one general identical divine power, governing the whole universe, creative of the heavens and of the stars, the living things in the earth and air and sea, the elements generally and individually, and all kinds of natural things. . . .[20]

The purpose of this and other similar statements by Eusebius is to show that there is only one power that created the cosmos, and not many.[21] For example, in the *Preparation for the Gospel* Eusebius contrasts the Pagan account of the origin of the world by many gods who have no love for humanity with the Christian account of the origin of the world by Jesus "our Savior," who is "Maker of the whole Cosmos" and "the one sole divine power pervading and ordering all things."[22] The term for the creative force remains *dynamis*.[23]

In chapter 16 of the *Apology* Eunomius goes on to treat the nature of the creative or demiurgic capacity. He says that if one argues that God is a father as a human is a father, i.e., in a corporeal way, then one must

---

infrequently in Eunomius' text and "there is no . . . entirely certain use of 1 Cor. 1:24" in the works of Eunomius. That Runia is on thin ice in this context generally is signaled to the careful reader by his mention of "(the semi-Arian) Marcellinus of Ancyra." If, as it seems, Runia is referring to Marcellus, then Marcellus can hardly be termed "semi-Arian" given the modalist character of his theology and his invention of the post-Nicene genre of anti-Arian polemic. Perhaps Runia has confused Marcellus with Basil of Ancyra, who was indeed called "semi-Arian" by Epiphanius.

[20] *Demonstration of the Gospel* IV.5, Ivar A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke*, sechster band, GCS pp. 155:24-27; W.J. Ferrar, trans., *The Proof of the Gospel Being the Demonstratio Evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea* two vols. (London: SPCK, 1920), I:170.

[21] E.g., *Preparation for the Gospel* III.13, 5-7, Édouard des Places, ed. and trans., *La préparation évangélique. Livres II-III*, SC, vol. 228 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976), p. 237.

[22] *Ibid.*, III:VI, 6. The same argument occurs at VII:XV, 5.

[23] This description of *demiourgein* as a function of *dynamis* may be contrasted with Origen's description of *demiourgein* as a function of *sophia*. When Origen offers his exegesis of John 1:1, "In the beginning . . ." he understands this phrase to mean that the Word is the maker of the material universe: it was the Word who said, for example, "Let there be light" as recorded in Genesis. This role as Demiurge falls to the Word insofar as he is the Wisdom of God; Origen does not use Power to describe the Word as Demiurge. See *Commentary on John* I, XIX:109-11.

also say that God is a creator, or demiurge, in a corporeal way, requiring a pre-existent matter to which God presumably adds form.[24] But, as Eunomius points out, neither is an appropriate understanding of demiurgic activity in God, for God creates by His authority [*exousia*] alone: ἐξουσίᾳ μόνῃ δημιουργεῖ.[25] The sense of authority, as used here, is that of the sovereign authority of the will, or, as I call it, the "political-moral" sense. Eunomius will refer to God's creative power, the *dynamis*, but it is a capacity which can be delegated and which seems to be synonymous with *exousia*, since Eunomius uses either term to name the immaterial character of God's productive capacity. Moreover, if power [*dynamis*] is understood to be used in this political sense as synonymous with authority [*exousia*] then Eunomius' description of the Son as perfect "minister" [ὑπουργός][26] due to his creation by God's power rests clearly on a political-moral model throughout. Thus, the direct and unique creation of the Son by the authority of God makes him the perfect minister.

Eunomius' interpretation of the divine activities performed by the Son is that their performance testifies to the Son's perfect obedience as a servant or minister to God (the Father). The Son's role as creator, in particular, shows the perfect agreement between the Son's will and God's will,[27] while at the same time indicating the difference in their natures, for the Son creates only in obedience to God and only by virtue of the capacity to create that God has delegated to Him. As Eunomius says: "He who creates by His own power [*exousia*] is entirely different from him who does so at the Father's command. . . ."[28] In short, Eunomius' position is that if the Son seems like God to us because of what He does, if He walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, and looks like a duck, it is because He is perfectly obedient to a perfect duck. This kind of conclusion in the *Apology* is supported by an appeal to John 5:19, namely that the act of creation by the Son is "at the Father's command and [thus the Son] acknowledges that he can do nothing of his own accord. . . ."[29] The same scriptural text is appealed to later in the *Apology* when Eunomius says: "For we confess

---

[24] That is, at *Apology* 15:13, 15:15b, 16:3-4, 16:6, and 16:8, all at *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53.

[25] *Apology* 16:8, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53.

[26] *Apology* 15:15, *Extant Works*, pp. 52-53.

[27] It should be remembered that Eunomius understood "God's will" to be equivalent to "the Father."

[28] *Apology* 20:20-21, *Extant Works*, pp. 60-61.

[29] *Apology* 20:21, *Extant Works*, pp. 60-61.

that only the Son was begotten of the Father and that he is subject to him both in essence and in will (indeed he has admitted that he 'lives because of the Father and that he can do nothing of his own accord'). . . ."[30] The Son's very identity and existence is expressed in terms of this action in obedience: ". . . what the Son is everlastingly is what he is also rightly called: offspring, obedient Son, most perfect Minister of the maintenance and preservation of all existing things. . . ."[31]

In these texts Eunomius gives his interpretation of what the activities traditionally attributed to the Son mean, namely that the Son's actions correspond to God's intentions. Implicit in this understanding is not only an assumption about the difference in kind of action between God and the Son, but assumptions about the specific kind of action that are particular to God. God does not create; He commands creation; He commands into being a creature to carry out the command to create; God does not maintain and preserve all things but commands that all things be maintained and preserved, and so on.[32]

In the *Second Apology*, written in 379, Eunomius repeats the understanding that the Son's demiurgic power was delegated to Him by God.[33] He says that the Son ". . . was entrusted (ἐπιτέτραπται) by the Father with the construction of things visible and invisible . . . for the power has been allotted to him for the production of things made. . . ."[34] Once again, the relationship between the Father and the Son, and in particular the Son's reception of a productive capacity, is described in moral or political terms. In this case, the terms are ἐπιτρέπω and ἀποκληρόω.[35] Eunomius intends these terms to anchor the description of the Son's creative power in its source, which is the disposition of the Father, by emphasizing that the Son acts only in obedience to the Father, and with the ability given to him by the Father for the allotted task.

---

[30] *Apology* 26:21-23, *Extant Works*, pp. 70-71.

[31] *Apology* 27:2-5, *Extant Works*, pp. 70-71.

[32] Although this idea of God's role strongly resembles the politicized cosmology found in *On the Cosmos*, where the unique glory of God is shown in the mediated character of His action, Eunomius' immediate source for such an understanding of God's role is the Genesis account of creation. Gregory's quotations from the *Second Apology* in *Against Eunomius* II make it clear that Eunomius looked to Genesis to support his understanding of God and of language.

[33] GNO II 282-283, NPNF V:237-238.

[34] *Ibid.*, 282:5-10, NPNF V:237.

[35] ἐπιτρέπω is at GNO II 282:5; ἀποκληρόω is at GNO II 282:8.

Power and Moral Union

When in his *Against Eunomius* Gregory of Nyssa quotes and criticizes Eunomius' statement that the Son "was entrusted by the Father with the construction of things. . . ." Gregory himself emphasizes the moral or political aspect of Eunomius' language. For Gregory, the term entrust, or ἐπιτρέπω, means that the creative capacity of the Son depends upon an authority or *exousia*,[36] without which the Son lacks both the courage (θάρσος) and the power (δύναμις) to create.[37] In Gregory's judgement Eunomius' political language for the transmission of demiurgic power is inappropriate, or more accurately, incommensurate, with the kind of power which is transmitted.[38] Gregory's opinion is that the power of creation is beyond any expression by political-moral language, and such language seems to him arbitrary and belittling. Given Gregory's judgment on the fullness of the Son's divinity this opinion on Eunomius' use of political-moral language to describe the Father-Son relationship comes as no surprise. However, Gregory's reading that Eunomius uses *dynamis* to mean *exousia*, and that the acquisition of this *dynamis* by the Son is political-moral in nature, is not simply tendentious, as should by now be clear, since political language of this sort occurs repeatedly in the *Second Apology* and other Eunomian works.[39] For example, earlier in the *Second Apology* Eunomius said that God creates without constraint or need, according to His own authority, and that His own will as power is sufficient for all that is made.[40] Eunomius goes on to say that God's will determines the goodness and the time of creation.[41] Eunomius emphasizes rhetorically through repetition, the primacy of God's will in creation.

> God . . . begets and creates according to . . . His will. . . . All good is according to His will . . . for it is a weakness to make what one does not will.[42]

---

[36] Gregory argues to this effect immediately after he presents the fragment quoted above, i.e., GNO II 282:13-283:26.

[37] GNO II 282:24-25.

[38] See GNO II 283:7-26, NPNF V:237, for this line of reasoning by Gregory. Typical of Gregory's thought is his comment: ". . . [Eunomius says of the Son] that to Him that is above all rule, and authority, and dominion. There has been allotted, as though He were put in some hollow spaces, power [*dynamis*] from on high."

[39] For example, in *Apology* 28:14-16, pp. 74-75: ". . . [God made the Holy Spirit through His Son] creating him by his own authority and commandment." See also *Apology* 17:12, *Extant Works*, pp. 54-55; and the *Creed*, I:8-10, pp. 150-151.

[40] GNO II 216:3-13, and 217:17-19, NPNF V:211-212.

[41] *Ibid.*, 216:18-21, NPNF V:211.

[42] *Ibid.*, 216:7, 10, 12, NPNF V:211.

It is in this section of the *Second Apology* that Eunomius says that "God has dominion over his own power. . . ."[43] Gregory's understanding is that if, as Eunomius, says, God has "dominion over His power," then God is not one with that power.[44] Eunomius' intention in making such an statement is to emphasize the priority of God's free choice in any act of production or creation, yet Gregory is not far wrong in his interpretation, for Eunomius does believe that the creative capacity is separate from God's essence, which is truly God.[45] It is, in fact, this separation which insures God's freedom from necessity or need, according to Eunomius.[46] Gregory's reading of Eunomius may be heavily burdened by sarcasm and hyperbole, but he does understand accurately that Eunomius' preferred model for God's productive capacity is a political-moral one. Eunomius does not hide, or even deny, this preference, and indeed insists upon it with great force and clarity when he says that God's activity is His will.[47]

Gregory's specific criticism of Eunomius' description of God's relationship to His creative power emphasizes the separate existence that Eunomius seems to attribute to this power, particularly Eunomius' statement that God has dominion over his own power.[48] Gregory's criticism is that Eunomius teaches that God's *dynamis* exists outside God's nature and is subservient to His will.[49] These two doctrines are in fact equivalent, for if something is outside the divine nature it is necessarily subservient to God's will, and only what is outside God's nature is subservient to that nature: God's nature is not subservient to itself. Indeed, the obvious fact that something cannot be subservient to itself is Gregory's point of departure in criticizing Eunomius for teaching a separate *dynamis*. Gregory argues that if "God has dominion over his own power," as Eunomius says, then God is not one with that power. Gregory goes on:

> Is [God then] something else than His own power, and Lord of a power that is something else than Himself?[50]

---

[43] *Ibid.*, 217:17-19, NPNF V:212.

[44] GNO II 218:8-219:17, NPNF V:212. Gregory says, for example: "Is He [God] something else than His own power, and Lord of a power that is something else than Himself?" GNO II 218:8-10, NPNF V:212.

[45] *Apology* 23:15-17, *Extant Works*, p. 64.

[46] *Apology* 20:20-21, *Extant Works*, pp. 60-61.

[47] *Apology* 24:1-2, *Extant Works*, pp. 64-65.

[48] GNO II 217:17-19, NPNF V:212.

[49] Cf. Daniélou on Gregory and Philo in *L'Etre et la temps chez Grégoire de Nysse* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970), pp. 86-87.

[50] GNO II 218:8-10.

This remark by Gregory is just the first round in an entire volley of criticisms directed at Eunomius' understanding of *dynamis*.

> [Eunomius says that] "God has dominion over His own *power*." Tell me, what is He? over what has He dominion? Is He something else than His own *power*, and Lord of a *power* that is something else than Himself? Then the *power* is overcome by the absence of *power*. For that which is something else than *power* is surely not *power*, and then He is forced to have dominion over *power* just in so far as He is not *power*. Or again, God, being *power*, has another *power* in Himself, and has dominion over the one by the other. . . .[51]

The veritable explosion of references to *dynamis* in Gregory's reply to Eunomius' statement that God has dominion over His own power suggests that there is something in this claim that would seem to Gregory quite radical in its implications and worth exploiting polemically. One clue to what might be so extreme in Eunomius' statement lies in Gregory's attempt to interpret Eunomius' doctrine as a kind of conventional anti-Nicene two powers theology, as when he says that if Eunomius is right, then God, being power, has another power in Himself. Though this is a crude restatement of two powers theology, it suggests how Gregory understood the passage from Eunomius and what about it provoked such a defence of the divine *dynamis*. Eunomius' phrase for what God has dominion over is *idia dynamis*.[52] This phrase has a history in Christian two powers theology. According to Asterius, the Son is the second power of God, who is "visible through the products [*erga*] of his ministerial activity."[53] This much at least sounds proto-Eunomian, including the ministerial reference. However, Asterius' phrase for the First Power, God as Power, is *idia dynamis*. For Eunomius the *idia dynamis* is the subject of God's dominion, that is, is not God. Even Asterius would have been scandalized by this phrasing! Again it is clear just how completely Eunomius eliminated a connatural productive capacity from his understanding of God's being and productivity, and, as a minor point, how far he was from the Eusebian-Asterian two powers theology.

---

[51] GNO II 218:6-13, NPNF V:212: I have emphasized each appearance of power in the text which is a translation of *dynamis*. Gregory ends his attack with a kind of "third man" argument against the idea that God has dominion over His power. How can God have dominion except through power? Does this power have dominion over the first power through the aid of yet another power?

[52] GNO II:218:7: ὁ θεός, φησί, κρατεῖ τῆς ἰδίας δυνάμεως.

[53] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), p. 33.

The Philonic Delegation of Power

Gregory attributes Eunomius' doctrine of a complete separation of the creative capacity from God's nature to the influence of Philo; in particular, Eunomius' phrase κρατεῖ δυνάμεως suggests Philo's phrase δυναστείᾳ κράτους αὐτεξουσίῳ.[54] At some level in his own theology, Philo did not separate causality from God's own nature; he understood true action to be the property of God alone. Yet following Fossum,[55] Segal,[56] and Winston,[57] we must add that this understanding did not prevent Philo from finding God's causality enacted through mediating powers. It may have been the property of God to act, but Philo still nearly always describes this action in terms of the separate *dynameis*.

> [There is] the creative Power called God, because through this [power] the Father who is its begetter and contriver made the universe, so that "I am thy God" is equivalent to "I am the Maker and Artificer."[58]

This kind of separation of creative power from God is what seems to Gregory to be Philonic in Eunomius' theology, so in Gregory's remarks Philo figures as the mask for any doctrine which describes God's *dynamis* as separate from the nature and possessing an intermediate and independent existence, which is definitely how Gregory understands Eunomius' doctrines. Whether or not Eunomius hypostasized the productive capacity, as Gregory charged, it is clear that Eunomius limited the use of *dynamis* either to describing the intermediate status of the Son as the creating minister of God, or to describing the intermediate status of the cause of the Son Himself.[59] Given the character of Gregory's comments, there is no

---

[54] The GNO sees here a reference to Philo's *Allegorical Interpretations* III.73, but Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, p. 246, doubts that Gregory's attribution can be "substantiated from the Philonic corpus that we still possess."

[55] Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985).

[56] Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977).

[57] David Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union Press, 1985).

[58] *On the Change of Names* 29, F.H. Coulson and G.H. Whittaker, *Philo*, Loeb V:158 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), slightly altered.

[59] "The Neo-Arians were always exceedingly concerned to avoid any suggestion that God had intimate contact with the bodily world; Eunomius went so far as to say the Son 'actively carried out the things which belong to love of humanity' but God remained inactive with respect to such grace." Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*. 2 vols. (Cambridge: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), p. 159.

point in troubling over whether he is being fair to Philo, who is referred to only as an important example of the understanding of divine productive capacity Gregory wishes to refute.[60]

However, there is no denying that Gregory recognized a genuine tradition in Hellenic thought, namely, one which removes causality from the highest being, and considers it a lower or secondary form of being. Modern scholarship would differ from Gregory by locating the paradigmatic expression of this understanding of a transcendent causality in the thought of Numenius,[61] a name often mentioned in scholarship as typifying the general philosophical climate of Alexandria in Arius' day,[62] and indeed as the source for Arius' use of "dyad" and "demiurge."[63] John Dillon has recently shown Numenius' influence in the later stages of the trinitarian controversy as well. Furthermore, numerous scholars, of whom the most recent is once again Dillon, have suggested that a doctrine like Numenius' of a personally inactive primal god, or Father, shows the influence of Aristotle's thought, principally his idea in *Metaphysics* XII of the unmoved mover. The single causal act of the unmoved first cause devolves first and foremost into the delegation of the demiurgic capacity to an intermediary. I men-

---

[60] The Philonic reference also allows Gregory the opportunity to reduce Eunomius' theology to a form of Judaism, by now a conventional pro-Nicene polemical device.

[61] Numenius' extant writings can be found in the Édouard des Places edition, *Numenius Fragments* (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1973). Des Places directs the reader to R.P. Festugière's commentary on the fragments in his *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (1953; rpt., Paris: Société d'Éditions Les Belles Lettres, 1983), IV:123-132. The contemporary reader is better served by first reading John Dillon's treatment of Numenius in his *The Middle Platonists* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 361-379. The same author considers Numenius' influence on early trinitarian theology in his article, "Logos and Trinity: Patterns of Platonist Influence on Early Christianity," in *The Philosophy in Christianity*, ed. G. Vessey, pp. 1-13. C.K. Mathias has recently identified the same tradition in a slightly different way on p. 63 of his "Parallel Structures in the Metaphysics of Iamblichus and Ibn Gabirol," *Neoplatonism and Jewish Thought*, Lenn E. Goodman, ed. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 61-76. Mathias singles out hellenistic philosophers who taught "a 'self-generating' second principle that creates itself out of the quiescent first principle." Among those who held this position Mathias includes the author of "*De Mundo*, Numenius, the *Codex Bruciacianus*, the Peratae, and the *Chaldean Oracles*." Mathias is noncommital about placing Philo wholly in this tradition, as am I.

[62] Williams, *Arius*, p. 223.

[63] G. Christopher Stead, "Platonism of Arius," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XV (1964), 16-31; see pp. 19-22. Dillon, "Logos and Trinity," p. 7, thinks that Origen found his distinction between "the good" and "good" in Numenius.

tion these judgements on the conceptual geneology of delegated productivity because Eunomius' errors were traditionally understood as owing to the influence of Aristotle. These traditional charges were polemically motivated and turned a blind eye to Aristotelian influence on the "orthodox." However, Raoul Mortley has recently argued, on entirely new grounds, that Eunomius' theology can in some meaningful sense be described as owing to an Aristotelian variety of neoplatonism.[64] Even if one does not accept all of Mortley's claims for Eunomius, he has none the less opened a new and wholly acceptable venue for discussing Eunomius' debt to fourth century Aristotelianism. Given Dillon's characterization of Aristotelian influence in a doctrine of delegated demiurgy, then my argument here adds another voice to Mortley's in suggesting that the original charge of Eunomius' Aristotelianism should be reconsidered and not simply reduced to a Cappadocian polemical device.

Gregory's Doctrine of Transcendent Power

If we turn directly to Gregory's own theology, we see that he describes transcendent causality in terms which suggest the ontological unity that he believes exists between divine nature and divine causality. Instead of the political language that Eunomius prefers, Gregory uses ontological language drawn from medical and platonic sources. He favors three terms in particular: δύναμις, συμφυές and φυσικὴ ἰδιότης. The sense of these three terms for Gregory can be easily illustrated. For δύναμις, "And what of the sun? Is it not . . . by the same power that it warms everything?"[65] For συμφυές: "Heat is a natural property of fire, luminosity to the sunbeam. . . ."[66] And for φυσικὴ ἰδιότης: ". . . as in the case of the sun and its beam . . . or of scents and ointments and the quality they emit; for these, while they remain in themselves without diminution, have at the same time, each concurrently with itself, the natural property they emit: as the sun its beam, the

---

[64] Raoul Mortley, *From Word to Silence*, two vols. (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag Gmbh., 1986), II:137-139, 151-159. On p. 147 Mortley says of Eunomius' thought that ". . . the overall fact remains: probably the best way to understand Eunomius would be to write a philological commentary on him, treating all his vocabulary as if it came from Proclus, Syrianus and Dexippus."

[65] GNO I 140:17-18, translated by Stuart G. Hall, in *El Contra Eunomium I*, Lucas F. Mateo-Seco and J. Bastero, eds. (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, S.A. 1988), p. 92 (hereafter cited as Hall), and NPNF V:71.

[66] GNO I 147:17-18, Hall, p. 95, NPNF V:73.

lamp its brightness, the scents the perfume. . . ."[67] These three examples illustrate the related sense these terms share; in particular, these examples show how Gregory understands *dynamis* in its technical sense and not in the common political sense. These examples will later give us clues to influences on Gregory's understanding of transcendent causality.

I must add that I choose these passages because they are direct illustrations of transcendent causality as Gregory understands it, in the language Gregory prefers to use for such things, particularly the example of the relationship between fire and heat. The kind of unity between an existent and its power exemplified in the relationship between fire and heat is fundamental to Gregory's understanding of trinitarian doctrine. In virtually every work where Gregory describes the unity of the Trinity he refers to the relationship between fire and heat as an analogy for that unity.[68]

For Gregory, the best examples of the relationship between a nature and its power are fire and heat, or ice and cold, and he regularly compares fire and its power heat, as well as ice and its power cold, to the divine nature and its power.[69] In each case he argues that we know of the presence of a particular nature because we recognize the associated power.[70] Gregory uses heat and fire, as well as cold and ice, to illustrate

---

[67] GNO II 196:12-18, NPNF V:204.

[68] The analogy of fire and heat to the Trinity is found in obviously trinitarian texts such as *Against Eunomius, Against the Creed* of 383, in *On the Trinity*, and *Catechetical Orations*, and in incidentally trinitarian texts like *Homilies on the Lord's Prayer.* The analogy does not appear in *On "Not Three Gods,"* but there power causality is otherwise evident.

[69] The use of fire and burning or heat and snow and cold to describe the Transcendent Being may be seen as a convention in the School Platonism of the era since these images are used by Philo and Plotinus to the same effect. These similes play a special role in Plotinus' account of emanation because they derive from *Phaedo* 149-150, as John M. Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 69, points out.

[70] GNO I 154:25-155:15, Hall p. 99. The same argument is used by Gregory in his *Refutation of the Creed of Eunomius*, but in evidence for the divinity of the Spirit. "For if his work is that named, He has assuredly the same power and nature [*dynamis kai physis*] as Him Who works it, and in such a one difference of kind from Deity can have no place. For just as, if anything should perform the functions of fire, shining and warming in precisely the same way, it is itself certainly fire, so if the Spirit does the works of the Father, He must assuredly be acknowledged to be of the same nature with Him." GNO II:402:15-19, NPNF V:132. The analogies of fire and heat and ice and cold appear again in Gregory's *On the Holy Trinity*, written within a few years after the books of *Against Eunomius.* What is distinctive about Gregory's use of this analogy in *On the Holy Trinity* is that in this text Gregory refers to heat and cold as *energeia*, and not

how powers and natures are inseparably related, such that the presence of the former invariably indicates the presence of the latter.[71] Each being has its distinguishing characteristics: the distinguishing characteristic of fire is heat, that of ice is cold.[72] Gregory makes explicit the understanding that

---

dynameis. This difference in terminology cannot be passed over lightly since Gregory's arguments in *On the Holy Trinity* and *On "Not Three Gods"* that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit have all activities in common has been interpreted as Gregory's fundamental insight into trinitarian theology.

[71] GNO I 176:1-10, Hall p. 110. For Rist, *Plotinus*, pp. 68-69, Plotinus' reference in *Ennead* V 1 6 to the relationship of heat to fire provides a helpful illustration of the kind of necessity inherent in emanation. In the same way that "fire would hardly be what it is without giving off heat" so too the One would not be what it is without the second Hypostasis proceeding from it. When Gregory uses the relationship of the power heat to the nature fire as an analogy of the relationship between divine power and divine nature he depends upon this sense of the necessary link between power and nature to indicate the kind of unity that exists between the two. Thus, it is necessarily the case that when one encounters heat one encounters fire, and it is necessarily the case that when one encounters Providence one encounters God, because of the necessary relationship between powers and natures. Gregory is not at this point arguing, however, for the necessity of the existence of the respective powers given the existence of the respective natures. The argument for the necessary existence of God's power, given the existence of the divine nature, comes later in *Against Eunomius*, when Gregory describes the Son as the power of God, and when he speaks of distinguishing power of the divine nature as the power to produce. A comparison of the appearance of *dynamis* in Plotinus' argument with its appearance in Gregory's makes clear that while *dynamis* appears in the Plotinus text almost incidentally, for the concept carries none of the argument, Gregory makes the reference to *dynamis* fundamental to his argument because he is interested in the kind of existence described by *dynamis*.

[72] In his *Allegorical Interpretation* I:3 Philo calls burning an ἴδιον (*idion*) of fire (as chilling is an *idion* of snow). He means by this term something that is both unique and distinctive to some specific thing: to burn is unique and distinct to fire and distinguishes it from everything else. The sense of *idion* for Philo is roughly the same as *dynamis* for Gregory. Both authors use the relationship between fire and heat or burning to illustrate the kind of relationship they wish to attribute to God and a capacity to act. Furthermore, both authors cannot simply identify "*idion*" with "*dynamis*": Philo cannot because of the immediate influences on his understanding of *dynamis*; Gregory cannot because of the immediate influences on his understanding of "*idion*." The same Jewish liturgical identification of *dynamis* with *doxa* which supported Philo's frequent identification of these two would also have prevented him from using *dynamis* to name what heat is of fire, that is, from equating *dynamis* with *idion*. Similarly, Gregory cannot identify *dynamis* with *idion* because of the recent development of the latter concept by Basil in his *Against Eunomius* II:28. Basil uses *idion* to explain how each Person in the Trinity is distinguished: the first Person is distinguished by the *idion* of being ungenerated or of being Father (these two are not identical), the second Person by the *idion* of being generated, and so forth. Basil has set *idion* as a means of explaining in what way the Persons are distinct;

the *dynamis* manifests the underlying nature: "In each . . . subject some inherent characteristics are observed, by which the identity of the underlying nature is recognized. . . ."[73] These inherent characteristics, the powers, serve as invariable marks or signs of the underlying nature or essence. Since powers are in fact inseparable from the natures, if one denies the attribution of a particular power to an existent, one necessarily denies the possibility of the associated essence as well. Similarly, if one denies the attribution of a certain nature, then one necessarily denies as well the attribution of the power unique to that essence.[74]

Fire's causality also provides Gregory with an example of the kind of unity that he means to refute and deny, namely that the Son is divine only because he participates in the Godhead. According to Gregory, Eunomius' doctrine of the Son's participation in divinity through obedience amounts to the same kind of unity that exists between a piece of iron held in a forge and the heat in this iron: the iron is hot, but only temporarily.[75] The unity between iron and heat is not connatural, for it is not in the

---

in Book I of his *Against Eunomius* Gregory is explaining in what way the Persons are shown to be united.

[73] GNO I 174:3-7, Hall p. 109, which culminates at 175:10-13 with Gregory's statement that: "Where things are different, the characteristics must surely be and reckoned different, and those which are the same in terms of being, will manifestly be identified by the same marks."

[74] Again see GNO I 174:28-175:13, Hall p. 110. At GNO I 176:11-16, Gregory describes this inseparability of nature and power in terms of time. For Gregory, the essence can never be without its power(s), and powers exist for the same duration as their natures. There is no separation in existence or in time between the nature and its power(s). Gregory's argument for the temporal co-existence of nature and power is, of course, pointed against Eunomius' causality which emphasizes the lack of contemporaneous existence of divine essence and cause. In Eunomius' system, the causal capacity (the activity) is temporary because it is not essential, that is, because it is neither identical with the essence nor does it have any necessary relationship with the essence. Gregory's argument for the lack of temporal interval between the divine nature and power is part of his argument for the lack of interval, *diastema*, in the divine life, which others—Balthasar, Balàs, Otis—have treated, and which I need not develop further except to emphasize that Gregory's denial of a *diastema* in the divine life is a part of his attack upon Eunomius' sequencing or ranking of the Son and Spirit, through an *energeia*-based causality in which there is a *diastema* between the *ousia* (or *physis*) and its causal powers or properties.

[75] This is a very important example for Gregory to use, for it originally appears in Origen's *On First Principles*, II.6.6, as an analogy describing the virtuous nature of Christ's human soul. According to Origen, while Christ's soul is not good by nature and therefore could theoretically choose good or evil, His soul embraces the good so thoroughly

nature of iron to be hot, but only to receive heat (to become hot). The sign of the difference between the way heat or light subsists in fire versus the way heat or light subsists in iron is the fact that iron can be either hot or cold, but fire cannot be cold. If the Son and Spirit are divine by participation and not by nature, then they are potentially receptive to the opposite just as the hot iron is receptive to cold.[76]

Gregory's doctrine of transcendent productivity thus stands in stark contrast to both anti-Nicene and some school Platonic doctrines of mediated causality. He is clear that the power that brings the cosmos into existence is fully transcendent.

---

that a falling away is virtually impossible. Origen then offers this analogy: a piece of iron placed in fire will take on the fire, so long as the iron remains in the fire, and could never become (or receive) cold, even though in principle iron is susceptible to both the hot and the cold. In the same way, Christ's soul becomes and is good, and could never become evil. (See Williams, *Arius*, p. 135, for a discussion of this passage.)

In *On the Holy Spirit* 16:38 Basil uses the presence of fire in iron to make the same kind of point as Gregory: unlike the Holy Spirit, the angels are not holy by nature, but holiness is received by them and exists in them just like fire is received by iron. Basil's use of this analogy is an implicit criticism of Origen, while Gregory's use of the analogy of iron in fire as an example of the wrong understanding of why the Son manifests the same power(s) as the Father is a definite rejection of Origen's reasoning on this point. More importantly, Gregory provides evidence that the pro-Nicenes rejected the idea of using the language of moral unity which described the unity present in the Incarnation to describe the unity present in the Godhead. Rudolf Lorenz, *Arius judaizans?* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980) has already suggested that Arius' theology of the second Person bears a remarkable resemblance to Origen's theology of the Incarnated soul of Jesus in his *Arius judaizans?*, pp. 215-222. Vaggione gives a good summary of this argument in pp. 70-72 of "Arius, Heresy and Tradition by Rowan Williams: A Review Article," *Toronto Journal of Theology*, 5/I (1989), 63-87. Vaggione proceeds to cast doubt on Lorenz's theory that "Arianism can be seen as deriving not from Origen's teaching on the Trinity or Logos, but from his doctrine of the pre-existent soul of Jesus Christ" by pointing out that "Almost all the evidence comes from the later stages of the controversy. . ." (p. 72). Gregory's argument suggests that in fact Origen's theology of the pre-existent soul of Christ may have played a role in Eunomius' trinitarian theology.

[76] ". . . to suppose that the nature of each of them [Son and Spirit] is necessarily defectible, equally receptive of opposites and lying on the boundary between good and its opposite, is utterly profane. One who says this will be arguing that it is one thing in its own proper definition, and becomes something else by participation in good and evil. Thus with iron it happens that, if it associates for a long time with fire, it takes on the quality of heat, while remaining iron, but if it gets into snow or ice, it changes its quality towards the prevailing influence, taking the cold of the snow into its own intimate parts." GNO I 110:5-14, Hall p. 76.

> . . . [T]here is no question that the universe is bordered by the Power [*dynamis*] of the Creator and lies within creation's limits. But the Power [*dynamis*] that creates beings, which by itself bounds the nature of originated things, has itself nothing to contain it. . . .[77]

This understanding is shortly re-stated by Gregory in an even more pointedly anti-Eunomian form.

> [The *ousia*] is before all beginning, it provides no tokens of its own nature, but is known only in being incomprehensible. This is in fact its most characteristic mark, that its nature is superior to every concept by which it might be recognized. . . . For every thought that applies to the uncreated Power [*dynamis*] is "high" and is principle, and demands the name "most authentic"[78]

In this passage Gregory takes over Eunomius' own language for describing the transcendence of the divine *ousia* and applies it to the divine *dynamis* as a description of the kind of existence appropriate to the power. The phrases "high" [ἄνω] and "most authentic" [κυριωτάτω] are Eunomius' own preferred terms for the First Essence, which he calls "the highest and most authentic being."[79] Gregory's point is simple: the transcendence and priority Eunomius found in (and limited to) the uniquely divine *ousia* of God (the Father) is in fact properly attributed to the *dynamis* common to the three Persons. To refute Eunomius, Gregory attributes the transcendent language associated with the essence to the power. I emphasize that Gregory appropriates and applies this transcendent language to the *dynamis*, and not simply to the *physis*. In a polemic one expects disputed language to be

---

[77] GNO I 135:15-19, Hall p. 89, translation slightly altered. The word "bounds" is a translation of περιγραφή, a term which appears in Eunomius' summary of his beliefs, and also appears in Gregory's statement at GNO I 77:7-10 that "Things are naturally 'circumscribed' only by what is opposite to them," which is the understanding Gregory gives the term here. (Περιγραφή appears in Origen's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, where it is used to name an independently subsistent existent. I also note Jean Daniélou's useful discussion of the significance of *perigraphe* in Clement of Alexandria's writings; see *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973], pp. 373-375.) Gregory's use of the term here indicates his revision of Eunomius' formulae. This kind of correcting of Eunomius' doctrines by Gregory is more pronounced in the very next passage quoted.

[78] GNO I 137:3-6; 17-19, Hall p. 90.

[79] GNO I 72:1-2, Hall p. 57. Another borrowing from 72:1-2 is at 137:18, which echoes Eunomius' language at 72:12. In a passage from 136:24-25, he speaks of the power as "high and blessed," which also suggests that Gregory is re-working Eunomius' own language, though there is no clear parallel with Eunomius' language.

reclaimed: what is noteworthy is that Gregory reclaims it for the power. I cite one more passage from Gregory:

> . . . that high and blessed Power, to which all things are always equally instantaneously present, both what is past and what is awaited are seen to be firmly held by the Power which embraces all.[80]

The appearance of power in such descriptions of the Transcendent is distinctive. Gregory has not taken the course of separating the divine power from the transcendent existence. Moreover, in each of these passages Gregory refers to the transcendent power, not, as one might expect, to the transcendent nature. It is not simply the case that Gregory considers power and nature so united that he can freely substitute one for the other: Gregory uses power in preference to nature. For Gregory this unity between the divine *dynamis* and divine *physis* is both so complete and so significant that he is led to speak of the transcendent *dynamis* more than the transcendent *physis*, with the result that the title "divine *dynamis*" replaces "divine *physis*" in Gregory's writings. (Or, alternately, one may set Gregory's writings in a sequence according to their use of "divine *dynamis*" as the preferred title for God.) One may in fact say that as Gregory's theology matures his use of the phrases divine power and transcendent power increases. For example, these phrases appear relatively rarely in *On the Making of Man*, but regularly in *Life of Moses*.

The Power Beyond Being

Gregory's description of the divine power as "transcendent" appears in a wide variety of his writings: in *On the Soul and Resurrection*,[81] *On the Premature Death of Infants*,[82] and *Catechetical Orations*,[83] as well as the four books against Eunomius' writings.[84] For "transcendent" Gregory uses, in order of frequency, ὑπερέχων, ὑπερκείμενος, or, much less typically, ὑψηλός. The phrase δυνάμει ὑπερέχων has a significant history, for it appears in *Republic* 509 B.[85]

---

[80] GNO I 136:24-27, Hall pp. 89-90.

[81] See, for example, M 46 92C.

[82] GNO III:2, 77:20 and 78:25, NPNF V:375.

[83] See e.g., *Discours Catéchétique*, Louis Méridier, ed. and trans. (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1908), 114.5.

[84] The four books include the three of *Against Eunomius* and the book written to refute Eunomius' Creed of 383.

[85] See Paul Shorey, ed. and trans., *Republic*, two vols. Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937) II:106-107.

The appearance of *dynamis* here suggests an interpretative question for the modern reader: when does textual similarity constitute an implicit reference? When scholars find textual echoes of *Republic* 509 B in a passage that similarity usually centers on a description of *ousia*: a reference to 509 B is one which speaks of transcending essence. In scholarly practice, an approximate appearance of the phrase ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας (or ὑπερκείμενον τῆς οὐσίας) is considered to be a reference to 509 B. Yet there is no reason why a Hellenistic writer would see this aspect of 509 B as the most interesting and noteworthy feature of the platonic text. By applying the same standards as one usually finds used for *ousia*, I suggest that every time Gregory uses δύναμις ὑπερέχων he refers to 509 B. One such example is in *On the Soul and Resurrection* where he says that the "real Good" possesses a nature "that surpasses every idea that we can form of the Good and transcends all other power. . . ."[86]

What is striking about Gregory's use of *Republic* 509 B language is that he understands the transcendence of the power to be a guarantee or proof that the transcendent is in itself a productive power. Gregory's interpretation, *via Republic* 509 B, of the productive transcendent power has no precedent or authority in Origen or Eusebius of Caesarea. Origen's own use of Plato's text is as a means of advancing his own theological description of the Son or *Logos* as the Revelation of the Father.[87] Eusebius interprets *Republic* 509 B to support his case that neither the Son nor ideas are coessential with God the Father, as Eusebius puts it, ". . . because they have received their existence and their essence from Him who is not an essence, but far transcends essence in dignity and power."[88]

Thus Eusebius, like Origen, refers *Republic* 509 B to the Father alone,[89] while Gregory refers the transcendent power to the divine nature. Gregory's

---

[86] M 46 92C, NPNF V:449.

[87] Peter Widdicombe has argued that in Origen's theology *Republic* 509 B "acts as a handmaiden to his emphasis on the unique revelatory function of the Son." See his "ὁ ὤν and the Transcendence of Being in God's Thought," *Studia Patristica* XXVI (1993), 342-346. He also suggests, p. 345, that Origen may have thought "Paul's 'eternal power' and 'divinity' [from Romans 1:20] to be equivalent to Plato's 'dignity and power.'"

[88] *Preparation for the Gospel*, XI:21, 6; Geneviève Favrelle, trans. and comm., Édouard des Places, ed., *La préparation évangélique. Livres XI.* SC, vol. 292, (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982), pp. 154-156; E.H. Gifford, ed. and trans., *Evangelicae Praeparationes*, three tomes in four vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1903), 3:2, p. 586. Note the comment that "the Hebrew oracles with good reason proclaim [Him] as God, as being the cause of all things."

[89] ". . . [the Son was begotten from the Father] by the Father's transcendent and

intellectual precedent and authority for his understanding of the inherent power of the Transcendent is Plotinus.[90] The resemblance between these two authors in thought and language can be recognized in Plotinus' *Ennead* V 4, 1:

> If the First is perfect, the most perfect of all, and the primal power, it must be the most powerful of all beings and the other powers must imitate it as far as they are able. Now when anything else comes to perfection we see that it produces, and does not endure to remain by itself, but makes something else . . . as fire warms, snow cools, and drugs act on something else in a way corresponding to their own nature—all imitating the First Principle as far as they are able by tending to everlastingness and generosity. How then could the most perfect, the first Good, remain in itself as if it grudged to give of itself, or was impotent, when it is the productive power of all things?[91]

Plotinus is the most articulate and forceful spokesman for the idea that the power of production exists in the First Principle because of what it is; his description of the procession of the Intellect from the One as an "overflowing" of the One is well known and much commented upon. Power belongs to the First Principle and is not a characteristic of an intermediate being, and it is not something that can be delegated away. The productive capacity found in lower causes (the Intellect, the Soul) is a result of the power of the One "running down" with being to the lower hypostases. In the passage from *Ennead* V 4, 1 quoted above Plotinus describes the relationship between fire and heat, snow and cold, etc., as imitations of the first generation by the One. (A metaphysical version, if you will, of "We love because He first loved us.") The most important statement of Plotinus' doctrine of the One's productivity is given in *Ennead* V 1, 6, one of the Plotinian texts we are sure Gregory knew.[92] The specific language of V 1, 6 bears directly on the subject at hand:

---

inconceivable Will and Power." *The Demonstration of the Gospel* IV:3, Heikel, GCS 154:20-21, Ferrar, 1:168, emphasis added.

[90] For a typical Plotinian interpretation of *Republic* 509 B, see: "[Plato calls the One] the Good and that which is beyond Intellect and 'beyond being.'" V 1, 8:7-9, A.H. Armstrong, *The Enneads*, Loeb V:41 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966). See also: "[The First Principle] . . . is a great power, the greatest indeed of all, and arrives at being and substance: for that Principle is 'beyond being.' That is the productive power of all things. . . ." V 4, 2, Armstrong, Loeb V:149.

[91] Armstrong, Loeb V:143.

[92] There are several reasons why this text is worth noting. The presence of *Ennead* V 1 in Cappadocian writings is so ubiquitous that to a large degree if one speaks of Plotinian influence on the Cappadocians one means the influence of *Ennead* V 1 since

> [The activity of the One is] a radiation from it while it remains unchanged, like the bright light of the sun which, so to speak, runs round it, springing from it continually while it remains unchanged. All things which exist, as long as they remain in being, necessarily produce from their own substances, in dependence on their present power, a surrounding reality directed to what is outside them, a kind of image of the archetypes from which it was produced: fire produces the heat which comes from it; snow does not only keep its cold inside itself. Perfumed things show this particularly.

Much of this passage will seem familiar to any reader of Gregory. Perhaps the most suggestive sign of influence is Plotinus' and Gregory's combination of fire and heat and snow and cold with the example of fragrance, for in neither Origen nor Eusebius are all these similes brought together conceptually or textually. Plotinus seems likely to have influenced Eusebius' choice of fragrance to describe the product (the Word) as an image of its source (God). But the general sense of Plotinus' passage is better reflected in Gregory's theology: the kind of being God is means that God will produce.[93]

Conceptually what Plotinus and Gregory have in common is their insist-

---

this *Ennead* seems to have been known by all the Cappadocians. Furthermore, portions of this *Ennead* are quoted by Eusebius and are known to Cyril of Alexandria, suggesting that *Ennead* V 1 was one of the first texts by Plotinus to have any influence on Christian thought. See John M. Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature," in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, Paul J. Fedwick, ed., 2 vols. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981), I:162-164, 192-193, 209 and 215 and also Dehnhard's commentary on *De Spiritu* in *Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin*, Patristiche Texte und Studien, Band 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1964). E.P. Meijering, *God Being History* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1975), p. 105, thinks that Gregory of Nazianzus' reference in *Oration* 29.2 to the doctrine of "over-flowing" is to *Ennead* V 2, 7-9. Frederick Norris, comm., *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzen*, Lionel Wickham and Frederick Williams, trans. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), p. 44, follows Gallay, SC 250, p. 181, in finding the doctrine of "over-flowing" in V 1, 6. Gregory is more likely to be referring to *Ennead* III 8, 10.

[93] Meijering argues that Origen and Athanasius shared a "dislike [of] the idea of an inactive God in splendid isolation." *God Being History*, p. 99. This common feeling led Origen to postulate an eternal creation and Athanasius an eternal begetting (while denying the eternity of the world). Origen, Meijering says, "stresses the eternity of the Son as God's creative Power." Of Athanasius, Meijering says, p. 100, "as the eternal Father of the eternal Son, who is His creative Power, the one God was never lonely, inactive and in splendid isolation. . . ."

What Meijering misses is that the eternal delegation of creative power is still delegation: a doctrine which solves the problem of God's "splendid isolation" does not necessarily solve the problem of God's inactivity vis à vis creation. What is Meijering claiming for Origen that could not be claimed as well for Philo? Furthermore, there is nothing

ence that the First Principle is known to be the kind of Being that produces. Both Plotinus[94] and Gregory draw conclusions about the First Cause from what each produces: the One produces Mind and, through it, Soul; God generates the Son, and through Him, creates the cosmos. Eusebius had already spoken of the Son as the image of God because of the way He was generated (i.e., as an odor from perfume). Gregory is less inclined to think of the Son as transparent to the Father than to regard the fact of the Son's existence as an indicator of the kind of existence the Father lives: a life-giving kind of existence.[95] Similarly, the cosmos indicates that the Son lives the same kind of existence as the Father, since creation is proof of the life-giving existence of the Son. Thus a recurring name for the Son is Life-giving Power.[96]

As I have already noted, both Plotinus and Gregory conceive of this productivity as an expression of the Good. Gregory's characterization of this productivity as following from God's goodness is no less than Plotinus'. Goodness and power are recurring virtues in the lists Gregory regularly provides as criteria of being.[97] The best indication of the importance of power and goodness as criteria or signs of divine being is the summary of

---

in Meijering's description of the Athanasian solution to the doctrinal problem of God's loneliness that could not be attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea or even to Eunomius.

[94] See Rist, *Plotinus*, p. 69: "There is some kind of 'necessary' connection between the two [i.e., fire and heat], and it is that 'necessary' connection which we must bear in mind when we think of the importance and significance of this particular metaphor. Heat emanates from fire because fire is what it is.... [Thus the procession of the Intellect from the One presents the question:] What is the One that it emanates *Nous* and Being?"

[95] Hanson, *The Search*, p. 730, quotes with approval Holl's summary of Gregory's trinitarian theology: "Holl finely says of him [i.e., Gregory] that for him God was a life-imparting power existing in three forms." Hanson's remark is a good example of how the concept of power is noted in modern scholarship only en passant.

[96] For references to the Son as "Life-giving" Power, see GNO I 120:16, 230:20; GNO II 21:3, 32:2, 126:7, 132:23, 214:19, 243:21, 302:14.

[97] Gregory says, for example, "[Eunomius brings] the concept of size into the debate" to argue that one Person "is superior or inferior in goodness, power, wisdom and whatever else is piously attributed to the divine." (GNO I 95:9-11, Hall p. 69) Gregory's reply is that there "is no lack of wisdom or power or any other good thing in one to whom goodness is not something acquired...." (GNO I 95:12-15, Hall p. 69.) Or again, "[there is] no greater or lesser ... of power, glory wisdom, kindness or any other good one can think of...." (GNO I 126:11-16, Hall p. 89.) And finally Gregory lists the signs of divinity as: "deity itself, wisdom and power and being good, [being] judge, just, mighty, patient...." (GNO I 161:24-25, Hall p. 103.) Emphasis added in each quotation.

his faith Gregory offers in *On the Holy Trinity*: "... we confess three Persons ... there is one goodness, and one power, and one Godhead."[98]

What the Cappadocians reject in Plotinus' account of procession from the One is the sense of the real inferiority of the Intellect compared to the One and the inevitability of generation.[99] Eunomius had already savaged *homoiousian* and *homoousian* theology for removing God's freedom. The Cappadocians were sensitive to this criticism, as we see from Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oration 29*, and were careful not to present the Eunomians with anything to support their attack. The consistent Cappadocian rejection of Plotinian "inevitable process" language is in part an honest expression of their distance from Plotinus. But I suspect that such rejections are also partially motivated by an attempt to dissociate their theology from Plotinus before the Eunomians could, with some effect, associate Plotinian-like concepts with orthodox theology. In the *Apology* Eunomius accused those who taught the eternal generation of the Son of teaching the eternity of the world.[100] The argument for God's freedom was always the strong point of anti-Nicene theology, while the open flank of anything even resembling Nicene theology was the question of God's will in the generation of the Son.[101] Gregory's idea of divine productivity is indeed heavily indebted to

---

[98] GNO III:1a 5:18 ff., NPNF V:326-327.

[99] Meijering, *God Being History*, p. 105, says that "[Gregory of Nazianzus'] objection to Plotinus' doctrine of the generation is that it implies that this generation is an act against the will of the One." Elsewhere Meijering notes that the Plotinian procession involves subordination since what is caused is inferior to the cause. He implies that the Cappadocians were not as sensitive to the inherent subordinationism of Plotinian language as Athanasius would have been, because the Cappadocians acknowledge a kind of priority to the Father as cause. See pp. 94 and 108-109. One weakness of Meijering's analysis is that he treats the question of the freedom of God's will as though it were not an issue under intense polemical pressure, not simply historically (i.e., from Origen and Arius) but, more acutely, from contemporary anti-Nicenes like Eunomius. While he acknowledges Arius' theology as an alternative that Athanasius is opposed to, the issue of God's will is described primarily as an issue in a debate between Origen and Athanasius, or among Plotinus, Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus. It is not clear from Meijering's comments what would be different in Athanasius' theology if Arius had never been born—except that Athanasius would not have had to misrepresent Origen.

[100] *Apology* 22:10-12, *Extant Works*, p. 63.

[101] The virtue of Gregg's and Groh's book, *Early Arianism*, is that it highlights the importance of the freedom of God's will for Arian and Eusebian theology. Aside from Meijering's discussion of the doctrines of God's will held by Origen, Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzus already referred to, one can also see Christopher Stead's "The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy," in *Platonismus und Christentum*, Horst-Dieter Blume and Friedhelm Mann, eds. (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung,

the kind of productivity described in *Ennead* V 1, 6, but its Christian appropriation requires a correct appreciation of God's will.

Gregory offers his own tentative analogy of the way in which will and natural productive capacity act in God's generation of the Son. What if, he hypothesizes, we attribute the power of choice to a flame?[102]

> It would be clear [then] that the flame will at once upon its existence will that its radiance should shine forth from itself, and when it wills it will not be impotent since its natural *dynamis* at once fulfills its will.[103]

The choice of fire for a hypothetical example of a simple unity of nature with will is interesting for several reasons. While fire with a will may seem an unusual possibility to modern sensibilities, Gregory is himself familiar with a psychological theory which describes fire as similar to intelligence,[104]

1983), pp. 245-257. Stead is primarily concerned with the issue of the Son's free will in Arian and Athanasian doctrine, but pp. 253 ff. treat God's free will.

[102] GNO II 192:19.

[103] GNO II 192:20, NPNF V:202. Gregory has already spoken of the generation of the Son using the language of the ray streaming from the Sun, "whose cause is indeed the Sun, but whose existence is co-extensive with the Sun . . . who indeed is a second Sun." GNO I 180:20 ff., Hall p. 112.

[104] Another authority for using fire in this way is the Bible, since Gregory recognizes fire as a scripturally-based metaphor for God, as in Malachi 3:2,3, where "the divine power, acting like fire. . . ." See *Catechetical Orations*, NPNF V:496, including note 9. The identification of fire with intelligence is further illustrated in Philo's allegorical exegesis of Genesis 22:7B in *On Flight and Finding* XXIV:132-134, where the fire of "Behold the fire!" is interpreted as "Behold the mind, breath all warm and on fire. . . ." Coulson and Whittaker, Loeb V:81. Rist, *Plotinus*, p. 68, suggests that Plotinus uses heat from fire to illustrate the emanation of *Nous* because of the Stoic description of the *hegemonikon* as a kind of emanation from the sun.

The Christian authority for Gregory's theological application of fire is Origen and *On First Principles* II.7.3, where he gathers together the scriptural references to God as fire to support his etymology of the word "soul" (ψυχή) from "getting cold" (ψύχεσθαι). "As therefore God is 'fire' and the angels 'a flame of fire' and the saints are all 'fervent in spirit,' so on the contrary those who have fallen away from the love of God must undoubtedly be said to have cooled in their affection for him and to have become cold." Butterworth, p. 123. Origen's scriptural references in support of describing God as fire include Deuteronomy 4:24 and 9:3, Jeremiah 5:14, and Hebrews 1:7. In both his *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* 6:3 and *On the Holy Spirit* 16:38, Basil speaks at length on the importance of fire, including a familiar reference to the relationship between iron and the fire which sometimes inhabits it. Gregory of Nazianzus provides another example of the presumed relationship between God and fire when he speaks of those "bright students of Greek etymology" who derive the word "God" "from words meaning 'to run' or 'to burn'—the idea being continuous movement and consuming of evil qualities hence, certainly God is called a 'consuming fire' [at Deuteronomy 4:24, one of

one which he describes in *On the Making of Man*, a work of openly anti-Eunomian intent.[105]

Conclusion

The foundational role in Christian theology of the doctrine that God is creator can hardly have escaped the notice of any student of early Christianity. Even at Nicaea, when the threat of radical dualism seems only hypothetical, the rule of faith still begins with an affirmation of God as creator. My account of the differences between Eunomius and Gregory contains the suggestion that the early Christian insight into the significance of God as creator is not lost after Nicaea, but in fact serves as a frame for trinitarian questions. I have tried to sketch how the two opposed fourth century trinitarian theologies of Gregory of Nyssa's and Eunomius of Cyzicus found expression in the aetiologies available in the cosmologies of the day.

My argument may be said to detail what is already known by scholars in a general way: namely, that the kind of reasoning typical of the cosmological debates of the third century becomes formative for the trinitarian debates of the fourth century. Such cosmological precedents for trinitarian doctrines are relevant because the trinitarian debate was conceived in terms of the priority of God (the Father) over the Son and the cosmos, and the relationship between uncaused and caused. Doctrines of God and creation were introduced into the trinitarian controversy because all sides understood the question of the relationship between the first and second Persons in terms of productive causality. Origen had established for Greek trinitarian theology the view that any doctrine of the Trinity presumes an account of divine causality. Both Eunomius and Gregory accepted Origen's view; their different doctrines of the unity of the Trinity are argued on the basis of different doctrines of divine productivity. Eunomius and Gregory attach their understanding of the unity of the Son with the Father to an understanding of the unity of the divine productive capacity with the divine nature.

Eunomius' alternative to Nicene and semi-Nicene doctrines of the Son's generation was to teach that the Son was created; his description of the

---

Origen's 'fire' texts]." *Theological Oration* 30.18, Norris *et al., Faith Gives Fullness*, p. 274.

[105] Gregory refers to those who locate mind in the heart because intelligence is similar to fire, for "fire and the understanding are alike in perpetual motion." NPNF V:397, M 44 157C. In *Against Eunomius* II Gregory again refers to perpetual motion as a *dynamis* of fire: see GNO I 260:21.

Son's nature stressed both his created status (he is not the true God) and His role as Creator (he is God for us).[106] By contrast, Gregory's argument for the unity of the Trinity turns precisely upon his understanding that a productive capacity is natural to God. Thus Gregory argues that the common power of creation shown in the two Persons is evidence of their common nature. In this analysis he builds upon the understanding that divinity is naturally productive: this natural productivity, that is, this power, is expressed in the Father's generation of the Son and in the Son's creation of the cosmos. For Gregory the transcendence of God includes the capacity to produce; indeed Gregory's conception of this capacity as a power means not only that this capacity exists as a natural capacity in God, but because this capacity is the power of the divine nature, God's kind of existence is the kind that (re)produces. Gregory's fundamental insight, and his argument against Eunomius, is that the divine nature, insofar as it is the divine nature, is productive.

Marquette University
Dept. of Theology
Milwaukee, WI 53223

---

[106] In his recently published "Plotinos and Eunomios: A Parallel Theology of the Three Hypostases," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 37 (1992), 215-231, Panayiotis Papageorgiou argues that Eunomius' theology has as its starting point the "Neoplatonic (Plotinian) philosophical principle that the cause is greater than its effect." p. 231. I have considerable trouble with Papageorgiou's argument. First, in the body of his text on p. 224 Papageorgiou argues that "at the foundation of Eunomios' theology lies a basic Plotinian presupposition: that what is generated from God is outside of him and less than him." (Emphasis added.) Yet in a footnote on the same page Papageorgiou acknowledges that the principle that the cause is greater than its effect can be found in a wide variety of sources, some of which are not Neoplatonic. Secondly, on p. 231 Papageorgiou concludes that Eunomius "used *hypostasis* in the same way as Plotinos did before him, i.e., [as] equivalent to *ousia* or being. . . ." Papageorgiou seems unaware that there are Christian precedents for the understanding that "*hypostasis* is equivalent to *ousia* or being," as one finds detailed in Joseph T. Lienhard, "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," *Theological Studies*, XLVIII (1987), 415-436. In general, when Papageorgiou finds a term appearing in both the writings of Plotinus and Eunomius he moves to the assumption that Plotinus is the unique spokesman for a given term or concept (e.g., ἁπλοῦς). Thirdly, although Papageorgiou, p. 219, notices Plotinus' use of fire-heat, snow-cold, perfume-odor in V 1, 6, he fails to observe Gregory's use of the same productive model. Finally, although Papageorgiou is arguing that Eunomius "proceeded to develop a system of thought depended [*sic*] on Plotinos and Neoplatonism . . .," p. 231, he never offers evidence that Eunomius had actually read Plotinus.

THE PROVENANCE OF ECUMENIUS' COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE

BY

JOHN C. LAMOREAUX

The earliest extant Greek commentary on the Apocalypse was written by a certain Ecumenius. Many questions surround the provenance of this commentary. Was it written early in the sixth century or does it rather stem from the later decades of that same century? Was it written by a Monophysite? or by a Chalcedonian? Was the author of this commentary a friend and ally of Severus of Antioch? If not, who then was he? Such questions are important because Ecumenius' commentary is important. It offers an early uncial text of the Apocalypse of great moment for the New Testament textual critic. It is a significant source for understanding late antique efforts to support the canonical authority of the Apocalypse.[1] It contains crucial evidence of developing Mariological doctrines. Even more interesting, however, is the commentary's place in the history of polemic against Origen. Such themes are subtle, yet so frequent that one could read the text primarily as an attempt to provide an eschatological vision orthodox enough to replace that of Origen and his followers. But these are matters for another time.[2] Here our concern is that of establishing the provenance of this text—who wrote it? when? and where?

---

[1] By no means a dead issue in the sixth century. For instance, one of Ecumenius' contemporaries, John of Scythopolis, commenting upon the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, eagerly seizes upon that "apostolic" text's heavy use of the Apocalypse as important evidence supporting its canonical authority (*PG* 4:212C).

[2] For the text-critical value of the commentary, see H. Hoskier, "The Lost Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse," *American Journal of Philology* 34 (1913): 300-14; J. Schmid, "Der Apokalypse-Text des Oikumenios," *Biblica* 40 (1959): 935-42; F. Mußner, "Neue Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes," *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 66 (1957): 50-3. For its Mariological significance, see, e.g., M. Jugie, *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vierge* (Vatican City, 1944), 43-5. For the anti-Origenist themes of the commentary, see in particular the texts cited below at n. 13, though such themes also pervade the whole of the work.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

The recovery of Ecumenius' commentary on the Apocalypse

Studies of Ecumenius did not begin on a propitious note. The question of his exegetical remains was bedeviled at an early date by a host of false ascriptions. In the sixteenth century Donatus edited under the name of Ecumenius a series of lengthy commentaries on the book of Acts, and on the catholic and Pauline epistles.[3] Further troubles began to cloud the issue when in 1840 Cramer published under the name of Ecumenius a scholia-commentary on the Apocalypse.[4] The prologue to this set of scholia had been published over one hundred years earlier by B. de Montfaucon.[5] That the commentaries on the book of Acts, the catholic epistles, and the Pauline epistles are falsely ascribed to Ecumenius is now clear.[6] The commentary on the Pauline epistles, however, does contain at least some scholia which stem from Ecumenius.[7] The scholia-commentary on the Apocalypse, on the other hand, has been shown to be an abbreviation of Andrew of Caesarea's commentary on the Apocalypse.[8] As for the prologue, it is nothing more than a summary of the first few pages of Ecumenius' authentic commentary on the Apocalypse.[9]

In 1901 Franz Diekamp announced the discovery of the authentic com-

---

[3] Published at Verona in 1532. J. Henten translated these commentaries into Latin (Paris, 1547). The Greek text of Donatus and the Latin text of Henten were reprinted by Morellus (Paris, 1631). The latter was reprinted by Migne, still with ascription to Ecumenius (*PG* 118, 119).

[4] *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 8 (Oxford, 1840), 497-582, for the ascription to Ecumenius, see esp. iv-vi.

[5] *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (Paris, 1715), 277-9; reprinted by Migne (*PG* 119:721-6); new edition by Marc De Groote, "Die σύνοψις σχολική aus dem Kommentar des Oecumenius zur Apokalypse," *Sacris Erudiri* 32 (1991): 107-119.

[6] Rather, these are all anonymous catenae stemming at the earliest from near the end of the eighth century. See K. Staab, "Die griechischen Katenenkommentare zu den katholischen Briefen," *Biblica* 5 (1924): 296-353, esp. 352-3; *idem, Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Rome, 1926), 93-9.

[7] Collected and edited by K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 2nd ed. (1933; Münster, 1984), 423-69. They appear originally to have been marginal comments which were composed in connection with Chrysostom's commentary on the letters of Paul (*ibid.*, xxxviii). In this regard the *CPG* 3.7471-2 is not entirely correct—the commentary on Paul's epistles and the so-called *Scholia in Iohannem Chrysostomum* are one and the same work.

[8] F. Overbeck, "Die sogenannten Scholien des Oekumenius zur Apokalypse," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 7 (1864): 192-201.

[9] Corresponding to pp. 29-37 of Hoskier's edition (on which, see n. 10).

mentary of Ecumenius on the Apocalypse.[10] As a *terminus a quo* for this text, Diekamp noted a passage on Rev 1.1 where Ecumenius says that much remains to be fulfilled of these prophecies, even though more than five-hundred years has already passed. Since elsewhere Ecumenius, following Eusebius, dates the Apocalypse to the reign of Domitian (81-91), Diekamp concluded that the commentary could not have been composed before *ca.* 600. Three factors, according to Diekamp, allow one to establish the text's *terminus ante quem.* Firstly, there is a Syriac manuscript from the seventh century (as dated on paleographical grounds) which contains a citation of Ecumenius' commentary (BL Syriac add. 17, 214, f. 72b).[11] Secondly, Ecumenius affirms the unity of energies in the incarnate Christ. But he does this so casually that he must have been writing before the outbreak of Monoenergism.[12] Thirdly, Diekamp considered Ecumenius to

[10] "Mittheilungen über den neuaufgefundenen Commentar des Oekumenius zur Apokalypse," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1901, 1046-56. In 1929 Diekamp brought to light still further manuscript witnesses: "Neues über die Handschriften des Oekumenius-Kommentares zur Apokalypse," *Biblica* 10 (1929): 81-4. In 1928 H. Hoskier published the *editio princeps* of the text: *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse* (Ann Arbor, 1928). In an earlier article ("Lost Commentary of Oecumenius," cited above n. 2) Hoskier had expressed the hope that Diekamp would find time to publish the text in the near future. When such hopes did not materialize, he himself, with the aid of W.E. Blake of the University of Michigan, turned to the task of preparing an edition. Hoskier's edition is not without faults. He was unaware of the more recent work on the manuscripts by Diekamp (published in 1929), although he did arrive at some of the same conclusions independently. Moreover, Hoskier's editorial technique was largely governed by his concerns as a New Testament textual critic.—For a critique of Hoskier's edition, see the review by Peter Heseler, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, vol. 15, no. 26 (1930), cols. 772-7, which offers a host of crucial corrections and emendations and identifies many of the authors to whom Ecumenius refers and alludes. J. Schmid, "Zur Textüberlieferung des Ökumenios-Kommentars zur Apokalypse," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 19 (1931): 255-6, has noted the radical divergences between the stemmata constructed by Diekamp and Hoskier, a problem still unresolved.—Marc De Groote, who is currently preparing a new edition of Ecumenius' commentary, has recently published a thorough and detailed survey of the manuscript witnesses to the commentary ("Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Oecumenius-Kommentars zur Apokalypse," *Sacris Erudiri* 35 [1995]: 5-29; "Die Scholien aus dem Oecumenius-Kommentar zur Apokalypse," *Sacris Erudiri* 35 [1995]: 31-43).

[11] For his knowledge of this text Diekamp was dependent upon W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, part 2 (London, 1871), 915-7.

[12] If I understand Diekamp correctly, this argument lacks force, for Ecumenius was a Severian, whereas the Monoenergist controversy was primarily a Chalcedonian problem.

be under the influence of Origenism, especially with regard to the teaching of the *apokatastasis*.[13] And yet, "such a flirtation with the condemned teaching" would have been unlikely if Ecumenius were writing very long after the Fifth Council (553).[14] From these three factors he concluded that Ecumenius probably composed his commentary sometime soon after 600.[15] Diekamp further argued from the internal evidence of the text that Ecumenius was a Severian with respect to his Christology.[16]

In 1903 S. Pétridès brought additional evidence into the debate—two letters written by Severus to a certain Ecumenius.[17] Noting the recent announcement of Diekamp regarding the discovery of Ecumenius' commentary and summarizing his arguments as to its dates, Pétridès called attention to two letters of Severus (d. 538) preserved in Greek in the conciliar acts of Lateran (649) and Constantinople (680) and addressed to a certain Count Ecumenius and suggested that this person may be identical with the author of the commentary.[18] Pétridès did not attempt to reconcile the apparent

---

[13] This emphasis on the doctrine of the *apokatastasis* is not terribly evident. Indeed, more than once he polemicizes against it: Ecum. 112-3, 116-7, 118-9, 164, 186.

[14] If Ecumenius was a Severian, Diekamp's argument is not entirely valid, for Origen was condemned at a council whose authority was rejected by the Monophysites.

[15] Diekamp went on to show that Ecumenius' commentary served as a source for the commentary on the Apocalypse written by Andrew of Caesarea. The point was important, for it necessitated a redating of Andrew's commentary, which was generally thought to have been written *ca.* 520. Whence Diekamp comes up with 520 is unclear, for in an earlier article he dated Andrew's commentary to the period 482-510, "Das Zeitalter des Erzbischofs Andreas von Cäsarea," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 18 (1897): 1-36.

[16] It should be noted that Diekamp considered Ecumenius to have been the bishop of Tricca in Thessaly. He argued this point by identifying the Ecumenius bishop of Tricca mentioned in the *Prologue* to the scholia-commentary on the Apocalypse with the author of the commentary which he had discovered. This conclusion was put to rest by J. Schmid ("Ökumenios der Apokalypsen-Ausleger und Ökumenios der Bischof von Trikka," *Byzantinische-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 14 [1937/38]: 322-30), building upon N. Bees ("Zur Schriftstellerei des Antonios von Larissa," *Byzantinische-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 12 [1935/36]: 300-19), and arguing that a tenth-century bishop of Tricca named Ecumenius is the origin of the confusion. Cf. also N. Bees, "Eine weitere Wandmalerei des Ökumenios von Trikka," *Byzantinische-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 14 (1937/38): 330.

[17] "Oecumenius de Tricca, ses œuvres, son culte," *Échos d'orient* 6 (1903): 307-10.

[18] Mansi 10:1116-7, 11:444. In the conclusion to his article, Pétridès told of how recently his library was visited by the official historian of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the latter seeking information as to the identity of Ecumenius the bishop of Tricca. The author spoke of the labors of recent scholars and expressed his hopes that the Great Church will take "measures to make cease the untimely cult of a heretic by a portion of its children" ("Oecumenius de Tricca," 309).

inconsistency of a date *ca.* 600 for the commentary, and a date before 538 for the correspondent of Severus.

Some years later A. Spitaler and J. Schmid reexamined the evidence for Ecumenius' life.[19] They began with a detailed reexamination of the Syriac fragment mentioned by Diekamp. This fragment is found in a Monophysite catena consisting of twenty-five selections from various authors.[20] Spitaler/Schmid first presented an edition of the Ecumenius fragment and its lemma: "From Ecumenius, a careful man, who is very orthodox [*scil.* Monophysite], as the letters which Mar Severus sent to him show, from the sixth discourse[21] of those which he composed on the revelation of the Evangelist John." They next attempted to reconcile the internal evidence of the commentary with the testimony of Severus' letters and the Syriac catena. Spitaler/Schmid first appealed to an earlier article by Schmid in which a possible solution was proposed, namely, that Ecumenius may have simply made an error in his calculations.[22] Spitaler/Schmid then proposed another potential solution, suggesting that Ecumenius may in fact have been referring to the beginning of the Christian calendar as the point from which the five-hundred years was calculated. Finally, they argued that it is likely that the compiler of the Syriac catena was better informed as to Ecumenius' identity than are we and that there are good reasons for trusting his judgment.[23] All in all, they concluded, the evidence points to

---

[19] "Zur Klärung des Ökumeniusproblems," *Oriens Christianus*, Series 3, 9 (1934): 208-18.

[20] Among them: Philoxenos, Philoponus, Julian of Rome, Dionysius the Areopagite, and Severus of Antioch. When Theodore of Mopsuestia is mentioned, he is called "Theodore the heretic." Cyril of Alexandria and Theodotus of Ancyra are also cited, both of whom were important sources for the Monophysites.

[21] In fact the citation which follows is found not in the sixth, but in the eleventh *logos* of Ecumenius' commentary (pp. 226-7).

[22] "Die griechischen Apokalypse-Kommentare," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 19 (1931): 228-54, where he in fact suggested two solutions to the problem. Perhaps there were two men named Ecumenius, living within the same century, both commenting upon the Apocalypse, both of Severian persuasion. This he rejects as unlikely. (One can add that this suggestion is not possible in that the fragment from the Syriac catena is clearly taken from the Greek commentary of Ecumenius.) Perhaps, on the other hand, one can suppose either a slight imprecision or a miscalculation in Ecumenius' estimation of the time which had passed since the composition of the Apocalypse.

[23] The lemma to the Ecumenius citation is much more specific than that given to any other selection in the catena: this makes it unlikely that the compiler had made some chance error. The lemma does not indicate that Ecumenius was anything other than a layman: this is also the picture offered by Severus' letters, the titles of the

Ecumenius the commentator being identical with Ecumenius the correspondent of Severus.

A recent proposal

In 1980 Adele Monaci Castagno reopened the question of the provenance of Ecumenius' commentary.[24] In order to contest Spitaler/Schmid's identification of the correspondent of Severus and the author of the commentary and to argue for a date of composition *ca.* 600 (as is seemingly claimed by the text of the commentary),[25] Castagno argued against the hypothesis that the five-hundred years referred to in the commentary refers to the time from the birth of Christ rather than the time from the composition of the Apocalypse—and this, by a slip of the author.[26] It should be noted that Castagno has here conflated two distinct hypotheses presented by Spitaler/Schmid: *either* there was a mistake in calculation, *or* Ecumenius was reckoning the five-hundred years from the beginning of the Christian calendar. Nevertheless, is the context such as to give rise to an error of this sort? Castagno has shown, rightly I think, that the context does not naturally favor this new version of Spitaler/Schmid's hypothesis. The original hypotheses, however, remain unscathed.

Castagno next turned to Spitaler/Schmid's contention that a passage in *logos* 12 where Eusebius' dating of the Apocalypse is cited may not belong to Ecumenius' original commentary.[27] Castagno thought that this observa-

---

manuscripts of his commentary, a short notice in Liberatus of Carthage (see below n. 56), and the lemmata in the catena on the Pauline epistles. The Monophysite provenance of the catena also accords with the Monophysite tendencies of Ecumenius' commentary.

[24] "Il problema della datazione dei Commenti all' *Apocalisse* di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea," *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino: II. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 114 (1980): 223-46. In another study Castagno sought to elucidate and compare the commentarial techniques of Ecumenius and Andrew: "I commenti di Ecumenio e di Andrea di Cesarea: Due letture divergenti dell' *Apocalisse*," *Memorie della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino: II. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche*, serie 5, vol. 5 (1980/81): 303-426.

[25] Castagno begins with some convincing arguments as to the date of Andrew's commentary, placing its composition in the first or second decade of the seventh century. This can serve as a *terminus ante quem* for Ecumenius' commentary which served as a source for Andrew.

[26] Castagno, "Problema," 229; cf. Spitaler/Schmid, "Klärung," 213, 216.

[27] Although not integral to their arguments, Spitaler/Schmid had pointed out that

tion was intended as a justification for the argument that Ecumenius had mistakenly counted his five-hundred years from the birth of Christ. The hidden premises in Spitaler/Schmid's argument, which were graciously supplied by Castagno, run like this: of all the codices of Ecumenius' commentary which contain in *logos* 1 the reference to Eusebius,[28] only two report the same thing in *logos* 12, which may indicate an addition to the original text; accordingly, in his work Ecumenius would only once have mentioned Eusebius' notice as to the date of the Apocalypse, which in the opinion of Spitaler/Schmid (as interpreted by Castagno) "renders more plausible Ecumenius' error in calculation and his phrase 'more than 500 years' becomes a not insurmountable difficulty."[29] In defense of Spitaler/Schmid, one should point out that they were simply noting the ambiguous status of the section 258.8-259.28 in the manuscript tradition. As I read their arguments, they did not think that this weaker textual attestation somehow made Ecumenius' "slip" more probable. Moreover, it is still far from certain that this section is in fact an addition to the original text.[30]

---

the passage in *logos* 12 where Eusebius is cited may not belong to Ecumenius' original commentary. What follows is lacking in both A (240) and S (203): A (240) ends at 258.7; S (203) has an alternative ending, printed by Hoskier, 260.1-260.12. (Notation for the mss have first the letter assigned by Diekamp and then the number given by Hoskier.) It is also nothing more than a repetition—even if not verbatim—of material already presented in the introduction. It is not wise, I think, to place too much weight on the absence of these passages, for A (240) and S (203) do not contain the original version of Ecumenius' commentary, but rather a catena of the commentaries of Ecumenius and Andrew.

[28] Ecum. 39.6-7.

[29] Castagno, "Problema," 230.

[30] Those two, according to Castagno, being M (146) and V (155). *Sed contra dico*. . . . It is not clear whether both M (146) and V (155) contain 258.8-259.28. Certainly M (146) does. But the status of V (155) in Hoskier's edition is unclear: he says he uses it only to check readings in M (146) if they do not appear in S (203) and A (240). On the other hand, according to Diekamp, V (155) was copied from a *Vorlage* incomplete at beginning and end. And yet, I could find no *explicit* in Hoskier's edition for V (155), nor for that matter an *incipit*. A (240) ends at 258.7; S (203) has a short alternative ending, printed by Hoskier, p. 260.1-12, an ending that is found in a number of other mss (according to Hoskier's numbering system: mss 114, 139, 159, 241). In point of fact, 260.1-12 is the ending of Andrew's commentary (ed. Schmid, p. 267.8-16). The Ecumenian paternity of 258.8-259.28 depends not only upon internal criteria, such as those presented by Castagno ("Problema," 231-2), but also upon the exact status of V (155) at this point, as well as the whole question of the stemmata of the manuscript tradition. Of particular importance would be the reading of the T/V/O stemma and the relative value of its *Vorlage* over against M (146). That A (203) and S (203) should

Castagno next reexamines the Christological position of the commentary. If the commentary's Christology is not Monophysite, then it is impossible to identify the commentator and the correspondent of Severus, in that the latter is shown by Severus' letters to have been a Monophysite. This important point will be treated in further detail below. Here let us just note Castagno's conclusion, that one could just as easily read the text as propounding a Neo-Chalcedonian Christology. In general Castagno's whole argument for dating the commentary to *ca.* 600 rests upon the improbability of the identification of the author of the commentary and the correspondent of Severus, coupled with the inherent probability of the commentary's own claim to have been written more than five-hundred years after the revelation of the Apocalypse to John. Here let us also note that Castagno's arguments do not account for the fragment of Ecumenius' commentary found in the Syriac catena, a fragment wherein Ecumenius is expressly identified as the author of the commentary and as a correspondent of Severus.

Ecumenius the commentator

Biographical information on Ecumenius the commentator is sparse. From his scholia on the Pauline epistles we learn little that is specifically biographical, excepting the fact that he wrote such. As for the titles and marginalia to Ecumenius' commentary on the Apocalypse, from these we can infer only that it was unanimously ascribed to an Ecumenius and that (according to some) he was a rhetor.[31] Of key importance in this context is the Syriac fragment of his commentary and its lemma.[32] From this we learn that the compiler of the catena, writing in the seventh century in a Monophysite milieu, knew and used Ecumenius' commentary and considered its author to have been a Monophysite. He further specifies that he

---

leave off the conclusion of Ecumenius' commentary, replacing it instead with the conclusion to Andrew's, is perfectly understandable (see above n. 27).

[31] T (155A) ascribes the text to the "rhetor Ecumenius," as does V (155). M (146) simply says that it was composed by "Ecumenius." The manuscripts containing the double Ecumenius/Andrew catena, S (203) and A (240), introduce the former's comments with the lemma, "of Ecumenius." C (122) has a marginal note which reads as follows: "Know that the scholia of the present apocalypse are collected from the exegetical comments on the same apocalypse by the Archbishop of Cappadocia, Andrew, and by Ecumenius." The scholia in Paris gr. 491 and Vatic. gr. 2062 are anonymous.

[32] The text has been cited above.

is the same man as the Ecumenius to whom Severus addressed a number of letters. The witness of this compiler should not be passed over lightly. His information is quite specific and he is writing no more than a few generations after the *floruit* of Severus. He may well have known more than we as to the specifics of either the commentary's origins or the career of Ecumenius the correspondent of Severus.

That Ecumenius the commentator was a Monophysite has until recently been scholarly consensus, an opinion which goes back to Diekamp's article of 1901. Castagno, however, has problematized this interpretation, arguing that, although both Severus and Ecumenius show many points of contact in their Christological definitions,[33] these similarities are better explained by supposing Ecumenius to have written after the Fifth Council (553) and its victory for Neo-Chalcedonianism, a victory which rendered more acceptable a less strictly dyophysite interpretation of Chalcedon.[34] Many of Ecumenius' *formulae*, it is suggested, can be found echoed in the anathemas of the Fifth Council. Similarly, one does not find in Ecumenius' commentary any open denial of the Chalcedonian definition or the *Tome* of Leo.

In response, let us note that Castagno sought evidence for Ecumenius' Christology only in his commentary on the Apocalypse. One should, I think, examine all the relevant evidence. Of key importance—Ecumenius' scholia on the Pauline epistles.[35] These clearly show their author to have

---

[33] E.g., they both confess one person, one hypostasis, and one activity in Christ after the union, without confusion and without distinction.

[34] Castagno, "Problema," 236. A similar interpretation of the Christology of Ecumenius' commentary has been put forward by Brian E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1991), 259. He does not develop his arguments to any great extent, but remains content with citing Ecum. 32.1-9 and 255.11-8 (on which, see below) and stating that they evince a Neo-Chalcedonian standpoint. He does, however, continue to maintain the identity of Ecumenius the commentator and Ecumenius the correspondent of Severus.

[35] Is it reasonable to think that the commentator on the epistles is identical with the commentator on the Apocalypse? There are internal clues that this is so, though vis-à-vis every fragment edited by Staab one cannot be certain. Firstly, there are verbal reminiscences: e.g., commenting upon I Cor. 7.29-31 (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 437.14), he uses ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν with the dative with the sense "to dwell upon" or "to contemplate," the same being found in the commentary on the Apocalypse (Ecum. 31.10-11, 73.6, 195.18-9, 198.16). Although the verb with this sense is not without precedent, it is unusual enough to be distinctive. Secondly, Ch. Moeller has detected similarities between the two works with regard to their respective appeal to the Neo-Platonic and concrete sense of the *koinai ennoiai* ("Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient

been a Monophysite. Let me just point up four passages where this is most clearly seen.[36]

1. On Eph. 1.17: "St. Gregory in his oration on the Son, I think, took the two [titles] to apply to Christ: 'Father,' of the Word; 'God,' of that which was assumed; [he did this] that you might receive the Emmanuel [as being] from divinity and humanity and *in one nature.*"[37]
2. On Eph. 4.13: "By 'fullness of Christ' he means perfect knowledge of and faith in Christ, e.g., that he received flesh from a virgin, that he from divinity and humanity is *in one nature.*"[38]
3. On Col. 2.9: "but incarnate, having furthermore *one nature* along with his own flesh, even if he subsists from two opposites."[39]
4. On Heb. 1.4: "Christ who along with his flesh is worshipped *in one nature.*"[40]

---

de 451 à la fin du VI[e] siècle," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, eds. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, vol. 1 [Würzburg, 1951], 638 n. 5). Thirdly, the name Ecumenius was not common in the late antiquity. I have been able to locate only two other instances. A certain Ecumenius was honored in a late fourth-century inscription from Aphrodisias, see Ch. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* (London, 1989), 54-5. Yet again, a certain Ecumenius, *consularis* of Crete (382-3), set up inscriptions there in honor of certain figures in the Roman senate: A.H.M. Jones *et al., The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1971), 115. Given the rarity of the name, without evidence to the contrary it seems futile to posit two homonymous biblical commentators.

[36] To these passages can be added others which, if not distinctively Monophysite, in conjunction with the texts cited here lend weight to the thesis. On Phil. 3.20-21: "it is necessary that we not think it good after the union to divide *the one incarnate nature of God the Word*" (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 453.21-2). The phrase, "one incarnate nature of God the Word," was a Cyrillian rallying cry for the Monophysites, an expression which remained suspect among Chalcedonians until the Fifth Council, cf. Anathema 8 (Mansi 9:375 = ACO 4.1, 217.18-22 for Latin and 242.12-16 for Greek): "If anyone, confessing that the union was from two natures, divine and human, or saying one incarnate nature of God the Word, does not understand these things as the fathers taught, i.e., that, though the hypostatic union happened from the divine and human natures, one Christ was the end result; but rather tries to introduce from such expressions one nature (i.e., *ousia*) of the divinity and flesh of Christ—let such a one be anathema." On Heb. 2.9: Ecumenius condemns Nestorius for not adhering to a theopaschite view of Christ (Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 462.9-21). Another rallying cry for the Monophysites was Cyril's Twelfth Anathema, that on theopaschism.

[37] Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 448.5-8; citing Greg. Naz. *orat.* 30 (*On the Son*), ch. 8.

[38] Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 449.24-450.1.

[39] Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 455.4-5.

[40] Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 462.4-5.

The Monophysitism of Ecumenius' scholia is beyond doubt, for it is hard to imagine a Chalcedonian, either before or after the Fifth Council, expressing such views. If further evidence is needed, let us just note that later readers of Ecumenius' scholia were aware of his "dubious" Christology and attempted to clean up the problematic passages. In his comments on Eph. 4.13, Phil. 3.20, and Col. 2.9, all of which suggest a single nature after the union, later scribes have substituted *hypostasis* for *physis*.[41]

With regard to Ecumenius' commentary on the Apocalypse, Castagno is right to note that many of Ecumenius' Christological statements are not distinctively Monophysite and that we do not find therein explicit rejections of either Chalcedon or Leo's *Tome*. How else to explain the transmission of the text in Orthodox circles without (presumably) the corrections to which his scholia were subject? On the other hand, it should also be pointed out that we do not find affirmations of Chalcedon or Leo's *Tome*. In general, when Ecumenius turns his attention to Christological themes, which is not very often, he seldom rises above the level of Christological banality.[42] The single issue about which he feels strongly is the condemnation of Apollinarianism.[43] Only twice in his commentary does Ecumenius give anything like a detailed Christological confession:

> He became human, not by separating himself from his divinity, but by taking on human flesh possessed of a rational soul, so that the Emmanuel is understood to be united from two natures, divinity and humanity, [each of the two] perfect in itself and with regard to its peculiarity in natural quality and its difference, without the things coming into union being confused, nor for that matter divided after the ineffable and real union.[44]

> The Emmanuel is from divinity and humanity, each [of the two] perfect in itself[45]—[the union being effected] without mixture, without change, without

---

[41] Cf. Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, xxxix.

[42] He affirms that the Logos was hypostatically united to its flesh (Ecum. 62.24-5, 210.18-9, 245.25-7). Thrice he notes passages from the Apocalypse as being against Eutyches and Nestorius, but refrains from giving a positive Christology (Ecum. 32.9-11, 60.6-13, 136.11).

[43] That is—as seen by its opponents—that Christ united to himself, not a fully human person, but rather a body without a rational soul such that the second person took the place of Christ's human soul. In sixth-century Christological controversy, this label was commonly applied to those thought to compromise the full humanity of Christ. Five times Ecumenius states his objections to this view of Christ (Ecum. 32.3, 32.8, 255.13, 210.10, and 245.25-6).

[44] Ecum. 32.1-9.

[45] Omitting with M (146) the phrase ἑκάστη τῶν φύσεων.

> variation, and yet in a way that is still real. We are convinced that after the ineffable union there is one person, one hypostasis, and one energy. Even so, we do not ignore the difference of the natures, from which we say that the indescribable union was effected, nor for that matter the peculiarity in natural quality,[46] as our holy father Cyril says.[47]

Nothing decisive here, though even in these rather generic definitions we can find a number of Severian echoes. Firstly, the mention of one energy: Severus, polemicizing against the *Tome* of Leo and its statement that *agit utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est*, concluded that the incarnate Word had but a single energy.[48] Secondly, the expressions "from two natures" or "from divinity and humanity" are Severian, if not distinctively so.[49] Thirdly, Ecumenius' double mention of the "peculiarity in natural quality" is noteworthy, for this formula was for Severus "of first importance, serving at once to refute the arguments of the dyophysites and to guard against the errors of . . . those who mingle the natures of Christ."[50]

Although by ignoring the evidence of the Pauline scholia one could continue to argue that the Christology of the commentary is not discordant with the definitions of the Fifth Council, there is one very serious obstacle to such a thesis. In his commentary Ecumenius cites Evagrius ὁ τὰ γνωστικὰ μέγας as an authoritative father.[51] If Ecumenius was a Chalcedonian and was writing after the condemnation of Origenism at the Fifth Council, such approbation seems highly unlikely.

Finally, one can point to Ecumenius' comments on Rev. 2.1. Why does the text address itself first to the church of Ephesus? Ecumenius' answer—because the church in Ephesus has preeminence over the rest of Asia (προκαθεζομένη τῆς λοιπῆς Ἀσίας).[52] No mention is made of the fact that the Council of Chalcedon, in its 28th Canon, had ruled that the metropolitan bishops of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace were to have their elections confirmed and their ordinations performed by the bishop of

---

[46] Hoskier's edition should be emended at this point. He prints ἡ κατὰ ποιότητα φυσικὴ ἰδιότης and gives as a variant in M (146) ἡ κατὰ ποιότητα φυσικὴν ἰδιότητα. Read instead: ἡ κατὰ ποιότητα φυσικὴν ἰδιότης. For this technical expression, see J. Lebon, "La christologie du monophysisme syrien," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, eds. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, vol. 1 (Würzburg, 1951), 534-42.

[47] Ecum. 255.11-8.

[48] Lebon, "Christologie," 553-5.

[49] Lebon, "Christologie," 510-11.

[50] Lebon, "Christologie," 536.

[51] Ecum. 122.19-25.

[52] Ecum. 46.14-6.

Constantinople.[53] Neither is any mention made on Rev. 2.5 of the traditions recorded by Andrew, such that: "Certain people have understood by the movement of the lamp the highpriestly throne of Ephesus when it was transferred to the emperor's rule."[54] Such silences vis-à-vis Chalcedonian changes in the status of the metropolitan of Ephesus may in fact reflect Ecumenius' rejection of the authority of the Council of Chalcedon to make such changes.

Ecumenius the correspondent of Severus

Two—or more properly four—of Severus' letters have thus far been introduced into the debate. Pétridès noted two fragmentary Greek letters which Severus addressed to Ecumenius, one cited at the Lateran Council (649), the other at Constantinople (680). Schmid, referring to the work of Pétridès, also mentioned two letters, but unwittingly introduced two additional letters, this time in Syriac.[55] There is, however, a great deal more in the Severian epistolary corpus relating to Ecumenius—no fewer than nine of his letters are addressed to Ecumenius or make reference to him.[56] From these letters we can now construct a fairly clear picture of the identity of Ecumenius.

Ecumenius was married, for in one letter Severus appends a greeting to Ecumenius' wife, "a partner and a helper in the affairs of God."[57] That Ecumenius was a layman is suggested by another letter which alludes to

---

[53] For the 28th Canon, see, e.g., J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions* (Crestwood, 1989), 181-3.

[54] Andrew, ed. Schmid, p. 25.17-8.

[55] "Griechischen Apokalypse-Kommentare," 237; cf. "Klärung," 213.

[56] *Select Epistles* 1.1, 1.5, 1.23 (Brooks, ed. and tr., *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch*, 2 vols. in 4 [London, 1902/4]); *Epistles* 1, 2, 3, 64 (Brooks, ed. and tr., *PO* 12.2 and 14.1); two fragments of another letter can be found in the *acta* of the Lateran Council of 649 (Mansi 10:1116-7); another letter from Severus to Ecumenius is mentioned in Liberatus of Carthage (wr. *ca.* 560), *Breviarium* (*ACO* 2.5, 133). Part of *Epistle* 1 is preserved in Greek (cited at Constantinople-680: Mansi 11:444 = *ACO* ser. 2, 2.1, 374-7). *Epistle* 64 is also cited by Peter of Callinicus in his *Contra Damianum* 22.701-22 (*CCSG* 29:362-5). The following dates have been proposed by Brooks: *Select Epistle* 1.1 written between 508 and 511; *Select Epistle* 1.5 written between 514 and 518; *Select Epistle* 1.23 written *ca.* 516/7; *Epistle* 1 written between 508 and 512; *Epistle* 2 written between 508 and 518; *Epistle* 3 written between 513 and 518; *Epistle* 64 written between 513 and 518.

[57] *Epistle* 1.

Severus' unsuccessful attempt at ordaining him.[58] More than once Severus refers to Ecumenius as a *komês* ("count").[59] In yet another letter it is specified that Ecumenius is from Isauria.[60] This same letter refers to him as a *scholasticus*, a title which indicates that he had completed the basic course of general studies and was qualified to take up law as a profession.[61] Nowhere else do we find this title applied to Ecumenius, though some manuscripts of his commentary do call him a "rhetor" which may reflect the same idea.[62] And finally, Severus' letters to Ecumenius were all apparently written in the first and second decades of the sixth century (between 508 at the earliest and 518 at the latest).

Two of Severus' letters suggest that Ecumenius was deeply involved in the ecclesiastical affairs of Isauria.[63] The first of these was written by Severus to Solon, the metropolitan of Seleucia in Isauria.[64] It concerns the punishment of two Isaurian bishops who had absented themselves from their sees.[65] Solon wished to seek the emperor's permission for the bishops of Isauria to assemble in order to resolve the problem. Severus preferred their deposition, though the thought of a council also appealed to him. Severus left the question open and bade Solon to refer the matter to their mutual friend Ecumenius, with whom Severus had already discussed the question at some length. The second letter concerns Severus' debate in Constantinople with John of Claudiopolis (a city in Isauria).[66] Severus was afraid that when John returned to his home city he would give a distorted account of what had transpired. For this reason he wrote a series of letters to various notables of the region, in particular Ecumenius. He wanted to give his side of the story and at the same time make certain that John would stir up no more trouble.

---

[58] *Select Epistle* 1.5.

[59] *Select Epistle* 1.5; *Epistle* 1 and 2. Cf. *Select Epistle* 1.23 where he is referred to as the "magnificent" Ecumenius, a title often applied to a *komês*.

[60] Cited by Liberatus.

[61] Rouché, *Aphrodisias*, 76-7, 107.

[62] See n. 31 above.

[63] For the sixth-century ecclesiastical organization of Isauria, see F. Hild and H. Hellenkemper, *Kilikien und Isaurien*, part 1 (Vienna, 1990), 88.

[64] *Select Epistle* 1.23. For Solon and his relations with Severus, see E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*, CSCO Sub. 2 (Louvain, 1951), 85-7.

[65] Musonius of Meloe (see Honigmann, *Évêques*, 94-5) and Paul of Olba (*ibid.*, 91-2).

[66] *Select Epistle* 1.1. Severus was in Constantinople between 508-11. On the wishes of Anastasius, Severus disputed with John of Claudiopolis concerning the *Formula of Reunion* (see next note). Fearing loss, John instead attacked the legality of Severus' ordination.

Severus' letters also show Ecumenius to have been interested in Christological affairs and other points touching the legitimacy of the Monophysite movement in its Severian form. One of Severus' letters to Ecumenius, for instance, concerned Severus' reception of Peter Mongus, while another treated certain proposed additions to the *Formula of Reunion*.[67] There is also a series of three letters in which Severus debated Ecumenius on the question of the properties of Christ's natures.[68] Ecumenius argued that those who speak of the properties of the two natures after the union should be anathematized. Severus responded that such language was not only permissible, but necessary. Ecumenius was not apparently quick to concede the point. He continued to argue his position in a variety of ways in at least four other letters only two of which are still extant.[69]

Ecumenius or Ecumenii

Let us here summarize the data regarding our two Ecumenii. We have, on the one hand, Ecumenius the commentator, known to have written scholia on the Pauline epistles, as well as a commentary on the Apocalypse. As has been argued above, there can be no doubt but that he was a Monophysite, espousing a Christology not unlike that of Severus himself. Following the compiler of the Syriac catena, it is reasonable to identify him as a correspondent of Severus. On the other hand, we have the letters of Severus himself which refer to or are addressed to an Ecumenius. These letters reveal a married layman who was closely involved in the doctrinal and disciplinary problems of the early sixth-century Severian Monophysite community, especially in Isauria, and himself a close confidant of Severus.

Is it legitimate to identify these two men? Given the rarity of the name Ecumenius and the witness of the compiler of the Syriac catena, this identification seems reasonable.[70] The only hindrance—the internal evi-

[67] For Peter Mongus, see the letter cited by Liberatus; for the *Formula of Reunion* or *Plērophoria* (a compromise Christological statement drawn up in 433 in the aftermath of the Council of Ephesus in order to reconcile John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria), see *Select Epistle* 1.1.

[68] *Epistles* 1-3.

[69] The five letters are mentioned in *Epistle* 3. Other letters to Ecumenius are concerned with theological issues, see, e.g., *Epistle* 64 and the two fragments from Lateran (649).

[70] For the rarity of the name, see above n. 35.

dence of his commentary on the Apocalypse, which seems to suggest that this text was composed *ca.* 600, and thus some seventy or eighty years after the date revealed by the evidence of Severus' epistles. How to resolve this seeming contradiction? Perhaps there is no real contradiction. It is clear that Ecumenius placed the exile of John to the island of Patmos in the reign of Domitian (81-96).[71] But if we count the period of five-hundred years from toward the beginning of Domitian's reign, the commentary could have been composed as early 581.[72] And if we suppose Ecumenius to have been a young man when he corresponded with Severus (say 25 years of age in 510), we can infer that at the time of writing his commentary he need not have been more than ninety-six years old. Unlikely, but not impossible.

There is, however, another solution, this being a modification of an hypothesis first put forth by Spitaler/Schmid who suggested that Ecumenius may have been counting his five-hundred years from the beginning of the Christian calendar. Let us turn to the passage in question.[73] At this point in his commentary Ecumenius is commenting upon Rev. 1.1 and the expression "the things which must happen shortly." Why, he asks, does the text say that these things must happen "shortly" (ἐν τάχει)? Why does it say this "when the things which will take place have not yet come to pass, even though already a great deal of time has passed since these things were said—more than five-hundred years" (καίτοι τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι οὔπω τετελεσμένων, ἤδη πλείστου δεδραμηκότος χρόνου ἐξ οὗ ταῦτα εἴρηται, ἐτῶν πλειόνων ἢ πεντακοσίων)?[74]

This passage would seem to suggest that Ecumenius means by "these things" which "were said" the prophecies found in the Apocalypse. And

---

[71] Ecum. 39.6-7 and 259.17-28, referring to Eusebius' *Chronicle* and *Ecclesiastical History* respectively. Cf. Ecum. 61.25-62.3, referring to the persecution under Domitian and noting both his *Chronicle* and his *Ecclesiastical History*.

[72] Eusebius, following Irenaeus, dated the Apocalypse to the end of the reign of Domitian (*EH* 3.18.3). Commenting on Rev. 3.10 (p. 61.25-27), however, Ecumenius implies that the Apocalypse dates from toward the beginning of his reign, for the angel prophesies to the church at Philadelphia that God will keep them from the coming persecutions of Domitian. This suggests that Ecumenius believed that those persecutions had not yet begun when John received the Apocalypse. Moreover, at 259.17-28, when Ecumenius cites this very passage from Eusebius, he leaves off the last sentence where Irenaeus writes "for neither was [the Apocalypse] seen long ago, but rather almost in our own generation, toward the end of the reign of Domitian."

[73] Ecumenius' comments on this passage run from 32.25 to 33.9.

[74] I take it that πλείστου is an absolute rather than a relative superlative.

thus one infers that his five-hundred years are to be counted from the composition of that book (that is, from the reign of Domitian).[75] But when one looks at what follows in the commentary a different interpretation is suggested. For immediately Ecumenius answers his own question: ". . . because all ages count for nothing in the eyes of the unending and eternal God." He continues by recapitulating the arguments of II Pet. 3.8 (citing Ps. 90.4), a text explicitly concerned with the delay of the Parousia. He then concludes that the passage in question must be interpreted allegorically: "shortly" refers not to "the measure of the times of the fulfillment of the things which will take place, but to the strength and eternity of God." Why does it mean this? Because every temporal duration is short when compared to the eternity of God. In short, when Ecumenius comes to answer his own question his focus has shifted to the more general problem of the delay of the Parousia. Hence, the five hundred years of which Ecumenius writes may well refer not to the length of time that has passed since John wrote the Apocalypse, but rather to the length of the delay separating Christ's first and second advents.

In support of this interpretation we should also note that there may be a polemical subtext to this passage. Elsewhere in his commentary Ecumenius argues at great length against chiliastic interpretations of passages such as Rev. 20.4 and 20.7.[76] Such interpretations, he suggests, are simply too closely intertwined with the heritage of the pagan past. A spiritual reading of the Apocalypse knows that it is not a question here of "the chiliasm of the godless Greeks, the transmigration of souls, the water of forgetfulness, or I know not what other idle and foolish chatter."[77] Judging from the attention he devotes to it and the vehemence of his rhetoric, this is a question about which Ecumenius feels strongly. One strand of chiliasm, moreover, basing itself on Biblical typology, put forward some very specific dates for the events of cosmic history.[78] The world will last a total of six thousand years and will be followed by another one thousand years of Sabbath rest in which Christ will reign. Christ was born in the year 5,500. The

---

[75] It should be emphasized, however, that Ecumenius nowhere specifies his manner of counting the five-hundred years, nor does he draw a connection between his statements about Domitian and the five-hundred years which he mentions—such is an inference of modern scholars.

[76] See especially, Ecum. 213-6, 219.

[77] Ecum. 213.16-19.

[78] For an overview of the typologies employed, see J. Daniélou, "La typologie millenariste de la semaine dans le christianisme primitif," *Vigiliae Christianae* 2 (1948): 1-16.

consummation of this world will thus take place in the year 500 of the Christian calendar. This type of chiliasm was found in both learned and popular circles and it remained in vogue well into the fifth century.[79] It is also a type with which Ecumenius was almost certainly familiar.[80] Ecumenius' decision to emphasize the fact that "more than five-hundred years" have already passed without Christ having returned may very well be more than a simple historical statement. It may in fact reflect his polemical stance against this form of chiliasm. Such a reading of Ecumenius further supports the contention argued above that the focus of his comments on Rev. 1.1 is that of the more general problem of the delay of the Parousia.

The *crux interpretationis* for dating Ecumenius' commentary is borne by the phrase "since these things were said" (ἐξ οὗ ταῦτα εἴρηται). It would seem that Ecumenius means by this the things which were said in the Apocalypse. The arguments which follow, however, imply that his actual problem is the delay of the Parousia. The question then is whether this five-hundred year delay is counted from the first coming of Christ (most likely the time of his birth) or from the time when Christ revealed the details of his second coming to John in the Apocalypse. Ecumenius' choice of words suggests the latter possibility; the logic of his argument, however, suggests the former—for at issue here is precisely the delay separating Christ's first and second comings. I would thus argue that if we follow the logic of Ecumenius' argument we shall have to conclude that he has been a little careless in his choice of words and that had he been more attentive he might rather have written something like the following: "even though already much time has passed since the events narrated here were first set into motion." Given this reading of the text, the passage of five-hundred years from the first coming of Christ (if we count from his birth) would provide a date for the commentary sometime shortly after 500 and would thus accord markedly well with the evidence of Severus' correspondence and the testimony of the compiler of the Syriac catena.

There are other possible explanations as well. One can always appeal to the first hypothesis of Schmid, that Ecumenius had simply made a mistake. After all, his commentary evinces no absolute chronology for the

---

[79] See Daley, *Hope of the Early Church*, 39 (Hippolytus), 122 (the early fifth-century, longer recension of the *Apocalypse of Thomas*), 123 (the middle or late fifth-century *Gospel of Nicodemus*), 179 (the late fifth-century *Theosophia*).

[80] Hippolytus in his *Commentary on Daniel* 4.23-4 (*SC* 14:307-313) was an early proponent of this view. This is a text known to Ecumenius (30.22-23).

reigns of the first-century emperors. He knows that Domitian was the second persecuting emperor after Nero, but nowhere gives more than this general, relative chronology.[81] Alternatively, perhaps the manuscripts have not accurately preserved the passage in question. Yet again, perhaps five-hundred was just a round number, not to be taken too literally. Any of these hypotheses would also be sufficient to resolve the problem.

By rather a round-about way we have returned to the place where Spitaler/Schmid left the question in the 1930s. But in the process, the arguments here presented have, I think, offered some cogent reasons for restoring the commentary to an early sixth-century, Severian Monophysite milieu. As for Ecumenius, he was a layman from aristocratic circles, but nonetheless closely involved in the doctrinal and disciplinary problems of the Severian Monophysite movement. We do not know where he composed his commentary, but someplace in Isauria is at least likely. This much can be offered as the provenance of this, the earliest extant Greek commentary on the Apocalypse.

Addendum. In a fine study Marc De Groote has recently taken up the question of the identity of Ecumenius ("Die *Quaestio Oecumeniana*," *Sacris Erudiri* 36 [1996]: 67-105). Basing himself on largely the same evidence as that utilized in this study De Groote has concluded that (i) the author of the commentary is not to be identified with the correspondent of Severus, (ii) the author of the commentary was perhaps a Neo-Chalcedonian, and (iii) the author of the commentary was probably writing after the Fifth Council (553). His argument for the first point is largely negative (pp. 91-97). Any attempt to identify the two Ecumenii must reconcile the testimony of the commentary ("more than five-hundred years") with the dates of Severus' correspondence; either that, or suppose Ecumenius to have written his commentary at a very advanced age, which is (we are to suppose) unlikely. This has not been done—De Groote rejects out of hand (p. 95) the arguments of Spitaler/Schmid, either that Ecumenius was counting from the birth of Christ or that he had made a mistake. Therefore, De Groote concludes, one cannot identify the two. In this study I have tried to give some cogent reasons for just such a reconciliation, especially as touching the interpretation of the phrase "more than five-hundred years." And again, I would emphasize the rarity of the name Ecumenius and the inherent reliability of the compiler of the Syriac catena. De Groote's pre-

[81] See Ecum. 61.26 and 188.19.

sentation of the first point is strengthened by his second point (pp. 97-100), for if the author of the commentary was not a Monophysite it is impossible to identify him as the correspondent of Severus. His arguments in this regard are similar to those utilized by Castagno. Nowhere in the commentary do we find specifically Monophysite formulae, condemnation of the ruling Chalcedonian authorities, or rejections of Leo's *Tome* or the Christological formulations of the Fourth Council. Whatever technical Christological expressions which one does find are Cyrillian and could equally well be classified as Neo-Chalcedonian. With these arguments one can hardly disagree. The rare Christological formulations in the Apocalypse commentary are common-place, seldom rising above a lowest common denominator of the Cyrillian sort—and are not thus decisive by themselves. In this regard the testimony of Ecumenius' scholia on the Pauline corpus are key, for these are clearly of Monophysite provenance. As these scholia were not utilized by De Groote, it is impossible to say how he would reconcile them with the thesis which he is arguing. I rather doubt that he would be willing to posit two homonymous biblical commentators, one a Monophysite and one a Chalcedonian. Thirdly, De Groote offers (pp. 103-4) a new argument for the *terminus a quo* of the Apocalypse commentary. In the commentary (112.11-21) Ecumenius treats of the question of whether the punishment of sinners in hell is eternal. Some fathers, he writes, have interpreted Rev. 9.5-6 in support of the thesis of a universal restoration (*apokatastasis*), while yet other fathers (by far the majority) and the testimony of Scripture suggest that the punishments of hell will be of eternal duration. Ecumenius then suggests that as a theoretical exercise one could mix the two opinions together. He emphasizes, however, that this is only a theoretical exercise, for he himself adheres to the dogma (τῷ δόγματι) of the church which teaches that the punishments of hell are eternal. Although recognizing that the word "dogma" can bear a range of meanings, De Groote suggests that there may here be an allusion to the condemnation of Origen, either in the edict against Origen (543) or in the acts of the Fifth Council (553). The argument is clever and novel; it is not, however, decisive. One can point first to other passages in the commentary where the word δόγμα or its cognates are used in a rather less specific sense, there meaning simply "teaching" (the normal patristic usage). See, e.g., 136.12, 14; 54.29; 48.18, 20; 64.21. Secondly, one does not have to wait for the Fifth Council to find condemnations of those who deny the eternal nature of hell's punishments. Severus was adamant on the point (*Ep.* 98 at PO 14:210 ff.) and himself linked this view with Origen's errors regarding

the *apokatastasis*. Thirdly, by making the author of the commentary a Chalcedonian writing after the Fifth Council, De Groote introduces the additional problem of the approbation which the commentary gives to Evagrius, whose teachings were condemned along with those of Origen. It thus seems unlikely that Ecumenius' use of the word δόγμα in this passage can provide a *terminus a quo* for the commentary.

1318 Valley Run, *Durham*, NC 27707 U.S.A.

REVIEWS

G. Wurst, *Das Bêmafest der ägyptischen Manichäer* (Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten, hrsg. v. Martin Krause 8). Altenberge 1995. VIII + 258 S.

1938 publizierte C.R.C. Allberry das koptische manichäische Psalmbuch mit einer englischen Übersetzung. Im Zusammenhang mit der Neu- bzw. Erstausgabe des Psalmbuches der Chester-Beatty Library[1] veröffentlicht nun Gregor Wurst seine an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität in Münster angenommene Dissertation, worin er sich mit den Bēmapsalmen, einem Teil jenes Psalmbuches, beschäftigt. Anhand dieser Bēmapsalmen analysiert er die Stellung des Bēmafestes im Festkalender der ägyptischen Manichäer. In Kapitel 8 legt er eine neue Übersetzung aus dem Koptischen ins Deutsche vor.

Der Ansatz, das Bēmafest als Bestandteil des Festkalenders der ägyptischen Manichäer so zu beschreiben, wie es die koptischen (und griechischen) Quellen allein ermöglichen, ist neu. Bisher wurden alle zugänglichen Aussagen mit dem Ziel, möglichst viele Angaben zu diesem größten Fest der manichäischen Gemeinden zusammenzutragen, kompiliert.[2] Der Vf. stellt die Hypothese auf, daß die Gemeinden in Ägypten und in Zentralasien eigene rituelle Regeln ausgeprägt haben könnten. Die zentrale Frage nach der "Urform" und möglichen "Fortbildungen" des manichäischen Ritus, einschließlich des Festkalenders, steht damit in einem neuen Licht. Aus der getrennten Analyse der in den verschiedenen Regionen überlieferten Fakten bzw. auswertbaren Materialien ergeben sich signifikante Differenzen zwischen dem Kultus der manichäischen Gemeinden, die bisher nicht genügend berücksichtigt wurden.

---

[1] Die vollständige Edition der koptischen manichäischen Bēmapsalmen legte G. Wurst nun vor in: The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library: Psalm Book, Part II, Fasc. 1: Die Bema-Psalmen, Turnhout 1996 (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum: Series Coptica 1).

[2] C.R.C. Allberry, Das Manichäische Bema-Fest, in: Der Manichäismus, hrsg. v. G. Widengren, Darmstadt 1977 (Wege der Forschung 168), S. 317-327; W. Sundermann, Bēma, in: Encyclopaedia Iranica, Vol. IV, hrsg. v. E. Yarshater, London—New York 1990, S. 136-137.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Besondere Bedeutung kommt dabei der Fastenpraxis zu. Der Vf. schließt aus der Tatsache, daß der dem Bēmafest vorangehende Fastenmonat in den westlichen häresiologischen und in den koptischen Originalquellen nicht erwähnt wird, auf unterschiedliche Fastenbräuche (vgl. S. 23-27). Ebenfalls können die im zentralasiatischen Manichäismus gut belegten Yimki-, d.h. Doppelfastentage (unabhängig davon ob fünf oder sieben), in den koptischen Gemeinden nicht nachgewiesen werden. Hier bezieht der Autor Stellung gegen die von A. Böhlig vertretene Meinung, daß die παννυχισμοί als solche Doppelfastentage interpretiert werden könnten.[3] Definitive Entscheidungen verweist er aber auf später, wenn die Pannychismoi-Hymnen publiziert vorliegen (vgl. S. 27-29).

Sein Herangehen an die Thematik, aus liturgischem Material Rückschlüsse auf die rituelle Praxis zu ziehen, ist erfreulich vorsichtig. Die Argumente für und wider eine Hypothese werden gegeneinander abgewogen und mit dem gebotenen Vorbehalt werden Entscheidungen getroffen oder aufgeschoben, wenn die Informationen nicht ausreichen. Zur Erleichterung des Verständnisses, das durch die intensive Erörterung der widersprüchlichen Fakten erschwert sein kann, sind wichtige Abschnitte durch Zusammenfassungen abgeschlossen. Den "liturgischen Ablauf" des Bēmafestes selbst beschreibt er (S. 109) in einer solchen Reihenfolge: "Am späten Nachmittag, zur Zeit der Todesstunde Manis, beginnt das Fest mit dem Gedächtnis seiner Passion und des Aufstiegs seiner Seele zum Vater. Die folgende Nacht verbringt die Gemeinde gemeinsam wachend und am Ende dieser Vigil folgt der Akt der Sündenvergebung." Die Sündenvergebung erfolgt sinnfällig mit dem Erscheinen des Lichtes, dem Sonnenaufgang. In einer Sammelhandschrift parthischer Hymnen aus Zentralasien, worin auch das Bēmafest erwähnt wird, finden wir das Motiv des Sonnenaufgangs ebenfalls.[4]

Als zentrales Moment des Bēmafestes stellt er die Erinnerung an die Passion Manis dar, wodurch erst seine Funktion im Heilsgeschehen und damit auch als "Vergebender der Sünden" verständlich wird.[5] Aus dieser

---

[3] Vgl. A. Böhlig, Zur Facsimileausgabe der Dubliner Manichaica, in: Studia Manichaica: II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 6.-10. August 1989, St. Augustin-Bonn, hrsg. v. G. Wießner und H.-J. Klimkeit, Wiesbaden, S. 74.

[4] "Es kam das Licht und nahe <ist> der Führer, erhebet euch Brüder, lobpreiset." (M 30/r/ii/24-26) und "Es kam das Licht und es naht der Sonnenaufgang, erhebet euch Brüder, lobpreiset!" (M 30/v/ii/9-10/), vgl. C. Reck, Mitteliranische manichäische Montags- und Bēmahymnen. Edition und Kommentar, Phil. Diss. Humboldt-Univ. Berlin 1991, S. 191-194 (unpubl.).

[5] "Nur vor dem Hintergrund der Deutung des Todes Manis, als eines Sieges über

Überlegung heraus ergibt sich, daß das Bēmafest, wie es uns überliefert ist, nur eine Gemeindebildung sein kann. Das schließt nicht aus, daß Mani selbst ein großes Fest für seine Kirche eingeführt hat, doch muß sein Charakter dann ohne einen die Mächte der Finsternis, d.h. den Tod, überwunden habenden Mani erklärbar sein.

Seine Fähigkeit zur philologischen Analyse beweist der Autor in seinen beiden Exkursen, worin er anhand des Vergleiches zweier Psalmen (BPs 230 und 231) mit den Psalmen des Kyrios Syrus und anhand des Verhältnisses zwischen BPs 226 und den Syruspsalmen Überlegungen über die Ursprache der koptischen Bēmapsalmen nachweist. Für die drei untersuchten Bēmapsalmen hält er ein aramäisches Original für wahrscheinlich. Der Charakter der Sammlung ist nicht homogen, so daß anderen Psalmen möglicherweise griechische Originale zugrundeliegen oder eigenständige koptische Dichtungen nicht ausgeschlossen werden sollten (vgl. S. 68).

Ein umfangreiches Abkürzungs- und Literaturverzeichnis, sowie ein Stellenregister beschließen den Band. Möglicherweise wäre ein sachlicher Index für den überwiegend am religionshistorischen Inhalt interessierten Leser nützlich gewesen.

Das Buch bereichert unsere Vorstellungen vom Gemeindeleben der ägyptischen Manichäer und fügt sich sehr schön ein in die Reihe der neuesten Untersuchungen zum Manichäismus, die auf der weitergeführten Auswertung der sensationellen Funde vom Anfang dieses Jh. und der neuen Entdeckungen in jüngster Zeit basieren.

Akademie der Wissenschaften
zu Göttingen
Unter den Linden
D-10109 *Berlin*

CHRISTIANE RECK

---

die Mächte des Bösen, als 'Erfüllung aller Geheimnisse,' wird es verständlich, daß er selbst es ist, der beim Fest auf dem eschatologischen Bêma Christi sitzt und, wie jener am Ende der Zeiten, schon jetzt seinen Gläubigen den Sieg zuteil werden läßt." S. 148.

Samuel N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (*Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 118). E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994. XIV + 325 pp., clothbound, ISBN 90 04 09742 2, DFL 150,—.

Lieu is one of the world's leading specialists in Manichaeism and, moreover, a prolific writer. Two years after the thoroughly revised second edition of his standard book *Manichaeism in the Roman Empire and Medieval China*, he now presents his (first) collection of studies. Five of these studies have been published elsewhere: the hitherto unpublished monograph article "From Mesopotamia to the Roman East—The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire" (22-129, with an appendix, not listed in the Table of Contents, on "Bundos and the arrival of Manichaeism in the City of Rome," 130-131) is, in an abridged form, still scheduled to be part of one of the volumes of *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* This article is, without doubt, a masterpiece of research on the Manichaean missionary results in Roman Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Arabia, Egypt in particular, and also in the Balkans and Asia Minor. Manichaeism's successful diffusion, however, caused violent opposition and this phenomenon too is taken into full and commanding account in this Chapter. Chapters V and VI focus on the refutation and vehement suppression of Mani's religion: "Some themes in Later Roman anti-Manichaean polemics" (156-196, with a useful "List of the main anti-Manichaean works in Greek and Latin (3rd-6th century)," 197-202) and "An early Byzantine Formula for the renunciation of Manichaeism—The *Capita VII Contra Manichaeos* of <Zacharias of Mitylene>. Introduction, text, translation and commentary" (203-296, with four appendices: 1. Anathemas against "latter day Manichaeans" (i.e. Paulicians) in the Long Greek Abjuration Formula; 2. The Short (Greek) Abjuration Formula; 3. The Milan Anathemas; 4. The *Commonitorium Sancti Augustini*). Chapters I and III are on "Mani and the Magians—*CMC* 137-140" and "Fact and Fiction in the *Acta Archelai*" resp. Somewhat beyond the scope of the collection's title is Chapter IV: "'Felix conversus ex Manichaeis'—a case of mistaken identity?" (153-155), a brief contribution, moreover, the essence of which in the present writer's opinion has in the meantime been refuted by François Decret ("Du bon usage du mensonge et du parjure," *Mélanges P. Lévêque*, vol. IV, Paris 1990, 144 n. 21; cf. now Decret's *Essais sur l'Église manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de saint Augustin. Recueil d'études*, Roma 1995, 118-119 n. 21).

This collection of studies (usually updated and sometimes slightly revised) will be of indispensable value to all Manichaeologists and, not less, to the

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

many other students of religion in Antiquity and in the Byzantine Era. Many of the texts under discussion are quoted at length and in their original language. The two indices (of persons and sources) disclose the volume's rich contents. Better proof-reading would have prevented the many (though mostly minor) typographical errors.

NL-3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Hubertus R. Drobner, *Archaeologia Patristica*. Die Schriften der Kirchenväter als Quellen der Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte: Gregor von Nyssa, Homiliae in Ecclesiasten (Sussidi allo studio delle Antichità Cristiane, pubblicati a cura del Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana X). Città del Vaticano 1996, 120.000 Lire, 254 S.

Der Autor hat sich die Aufgabe gestellt, die für die Archäologie und für die Kulturgeschichte im allgemeinen relevanten Daten in den *Homiliae in Ecclesiasten* des Gregor von Nyssa zu sammeln und zu kommentieren. Die archäologischen und kulturhistorischen Phänomene werden in einer übersichtlichen thematischen Gliederung dargeboten, wobei die Texte aus anderen Texten bei Gregor und anderen Schriftstellern erklärt werden. Bekanntlich gibt es einige Gregorstellen, die bereits bei den Archäologen Beachtung gefunden haben (wie Brief 25 über den geplanten Bau eines Martyriums, das bis in Einzelheiten beschrieben wird, und die Stelle über das Anhängekreuzchen und den Ring in der *Vita Macrinae*), aber Drobner hat mit Recht bemerkt, dass die vielen Realia, die sich in Gregors Werken finden, bisher nur wenig Beachtung gefunden haben. Die christliche Archäologie versucht zwar auch die Daten der christlichen Literatur der Spätantike auszuwerten (wie besonders F.J. Dölger und die Mitarbeiter des nach ihm genannten Bonner Instituts das in vielen Fällen beispielhaft gemacht haben), aber umfassende archäologische Kommentare zu einem Autor oder einem einzelnen Werk stehen noch immer aus. Wie nützlich eine derartige Studie sein kann, beweist die *Archaeologia Homerica* von Matz und Buchholz, das eindrucksvolle Beispiel aus der profanen Literatur.

Bei der Behandlung der Texte werden die Parallelen in den übrigen Werken Gregors herangezogen und die von ihm erwähnten Realia mit den erhaltenen Monumenten seiner Zeit verglichen. Können die Monumente einerseits neue Aspekte zur weiteren Erklärung des Textes ergeben, anderseits besteht die Möglichkeit, dass der Text über die bisherigen archäolo-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

gischen und kulturhistorischen Kenntnisse hinausgeht. Drobner beweist zum Beispiel, dass die Beschreibungen der luxuriösen Wohnstätten, die zur literarischen Gattung der Ekphraseis gehören, dennoch keine Phantasiegeschöpfe sind und die Umwelt der Zeit widerspiegeln. (Eine derartige Frage hatte z.B. Gussen sich auch bei bestimmten realistischen Beschreibungen des Luxus in Alexandrien bei Klemens von Alexandrien gestellt, eben wegen der literarischen Reminiszenzen.) Während Gregor in seinen militärischen Bildern in der literarischen Sphäre der homerischen und biblischen Quellen bleibt, können, wie sich herausstellt, seine Kenntnisse der Medizin und Astronomie dagegen als sehr genau und aktuell bezeichnet werden. Im kaleidoskopischen Bilde, das aus dem gesammelten Material erkennbar wird, sind gewisse Gegebenheiten besonders interessant: so Gregors Erwähnung von bei Tisch verwendeten Silberlöffeln. Für diese Verwendung im profanen Bereich fehlte bislang ein literarischer Beleg aus Kleinasien. (Es handelt sich hier also nicht um die liturgische Verwendung bei der in der griechischen Kirche üblichen Liturgiespendung unter beiden Gestalten.) Ausserdem finden sich in den Ecclesiastes-Homilien die ersten bisher bekannten Zeugnisse für die Existenz von figürlich gravierten bzw. getriebenen Silbertischen.

Wiewohl Drobner die Wichtigkeit der Texte für archäologische Daten besonders hervorhebt, müssen wir feststellen, dass die kulturhistorisch interessanten Texte in der Mehrheit sind (so gibt es Abschnitte über das Lebensalter des Menschen, die fünf Sinne, Kosmologie und Topographie, Ackerbau). Ausserdem handelt es sich öfters um ganz allgemeine Daten, die allerdings mit vielem Aufwand von Gelehrsamkeit und Kenntnis der wissenschaftlichen Literatur kommentiert werden.

In den griechischen Wörtern und Ausdrücken lassen sich gewisse Ungenauigkeiten nachweisen. Einige Beispiele: nicht ἥπατος (S. 60, 64, 247) sondern ἧπαρ ist die Nominativform; statt κρατὼν καὶ ἀποθούμενος lese man κρατῶν καὶ ἀπωθούμενος (S. 66); πρόωπος (S. 173): man lese πρόωρος; κράναι (S. 118): man lese κράνη (Helme); κνημῖδες (S. 118: man lese κνημῖδας) περιφρασσάμενοι (vgl. dagegen S. 247 -σσόμενοι).

Zwar ist die Bedeutung christlicher Texte als Quelle für ein besseres Verständnis der christlichen—sowie der profanen—archäologischen Funde seit langem anerkannt worden, die archäologische Interpretation eines einzelnen christlichen Textes bedeutet jedoch etwas Neues. Man braucht sich jedoch nicht zu wundern, wenn bei manchem Text der Ertrag wenig ausgiebig sein würde. Bevor man sich die "umfassende Erhebung aller archäo-

logisch relevanten Daten eines Textes" (S. 209) zum Ziel setzt, empfiehlt es sich, zuerst festzustellen, dass dieser Text dazu geeignet ist.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict.* Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. xviii + 494 pp. ISBN 0-8018-5377-X. Price $54 (hb).

D.I. Sly, *Philo's Alexandria.* London-New York: Routledge, 1996. xviii + 200 pp. ISBN 0-415-09679-0. Price £40 (hb).

Two recent scholarly trends converge in the publication of Christopher Haas' monograph on Alexandria in later antiquity. Of late there has been an increase in our awareness of how much we might still be able to learn about the remains of ancient Alexandria hidden below and beside the modern metropolis. No one is in doubt about the importance of the evidence. But it seems that frustration is being replaced by ingenuity, if recent reports of archaeological successes are to be believed. Moreover during the past twenty five years, as part of the tremendous burgeoning of interest in the world of late antiquity, a great deal of research has been done into the social dynamics of the large cities of the Later Roman Empire. But so far a detailed study of Alexandria was lacking. Haas' excellent book certainly fills the gap. It has the very considerable merit of bringing the past alive and at the same time allowing the reader to understand it better. It is alert to problems of methodology and convincing in the choices it makes. Such a book can only be written by a first-rate historian.

The main themes of the book are indicated by the terms topography, competition and control. Adducing recent urban sociological research, Haas argues that there is a significant interaction between the layout of a city and its social and political dynamics. How, for example, were temples replaced by churches in Alexandria when Christianity became dominant in the fourth and fifth centuries? Competition in Alexandrian society is exemplified by the interaction of what Haas describes as the three main "ethno-religious" groups, the Jews, the pagans and the Christians. All three are dealt with in separate chapters, and it is then shown how they interact with each other in analyses of a number of famous historical events. Control needs to be exercised, for the city is of great strategic and eco-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

nomic significance, and the populace has the reputation of volatility (Haas argues that this is a bit of a topos and that the historian is better off looking closely at what actually happened in the regularly recurring incidents of public violence). Both the imperial government and the city council attempt to assert control, but it is clear from the evidence that the most effective control was asserted by a succession of powerful Christian bishops, who could count on complete loyalty on the part of their followers and were all the more effective because they were prepared to be ruthless in the pursuit of their goals.

The study is extremely well documented. Every paragraph is supported by extensive evidence and copious references to secondary literature collected together in the footnotes at the back of the book. The evidence assembled is diverse and covers all the various kinds of sources we have at our disposal: literary, papyrological, epigraphical and archaeological. It is a great pity that we are not given a synoptic list of these sources, together with a bibliographical listing of all the secondary literature scattered throughout the notes.

There are numerous issues that one might wish to raise in discussing such a broad-ranging work. I confine my comments to two points. When starting his chapters on the Christian community Haas raises, as he must, the question of evidence. In contrast to the situation for the Jewish and pagan communities, we encounter here "the onerous blessing of abundance." Christian theologians write too much, or at least not the things that the social historian would like to read. "Much of the literature is theological in nature, and while some of these homilies and treatises may fittingly serve as the crowning glories of patristic exegesis and theological speculation, they provide scant material for understanding the urban milieu that produced them (pp. 176-7)." With regard to theological treatises and biblical commentaries the point may, I think, be granted. But it is surely different in the case of sermons. These were written to be delivered to the urban populace. The Christian layman whose walk home after attending a church service is evocatively described on pp. 189-91 must have listened to such a sermon. The sermons of Basil and Augustine yield valuable material about their congregations. Might the same not be the case for those sermons that have survived from Alexandria?

Secondly, I was puzzled by an imbalance in the treatment of the three "ethno-religious groups." In the case of the Jewish community Haas' treatment goes all the way back to the early Roman period (see the brief section on Philo's world, pp. 94-99). For the pagans and Christians this is

not deemed necessary. The earlier Christian Gnostics of the 2nd century are only mentioned twice in passing (pp. 150, 335). The rationale for the imbalance is given in the concluding pages of the book. Haas argues that the sharply defined communal boundaries that characterize late ancient Alexandria were the result of local circumstances inherited from traumatic events in earlier times: for Jews the disastrous revolt in 115-117, for Christians the persecutions of the third century. (For pagans the trauma was to occur later, in the period 380-420.) In his introduction he cites a text in Clement (a more exact reference than he gives is *Str.* 6.42.2) which speaks of the three peoples, Greeks, Jews and Christians. Are these *laoi* ethnic groups? This seems to me very difficult to determine exactly. As has often been noted, the Jewish community seems hardly to be a living reality in Clement's writings. My suspicion is that Haas' description "ethno-religious groups" obscures a significant development in Alexandria's history. Up to the 2nd century A.D. the chief lines of communal division were determined by ethnicity (Greeks, Jews, Egyptians), each people having its distinctive religious beliefs and practices. From the 3rd century onwards it is religion which determines the divisions (paganism, Judaism, Christianity). Only in the case of the Jews do race and religion continue to coincide, as they must on account of the particular nature of Judaism. These changes are brought about not only by religious developments (esp. the rise of Christianity), but also by changes in the nature of Alexandrian citizenship. The text of Clement is unclear because he is living exactly in the transition period in this development.

Finally some brief words about another, less ambitious book on an earlier period in Alexandria's rich history. The Canadian scholar Dorothy Sly has done most of her research so far on the attitude of the Jewish exegete and philosopher Philo to Alexandria to women. Although by any reckoning he does not score too well in this area, Sly states that she cannot help liking many facets of his personality and his writings. In the preparation of this book she conceived the splendid idea of combing through Philo's copious works and collecting all that they can tell us about contemporary Alexandria. The result is a series of eleven chapters discussing the various aspects of Alexandrian city life as seen chiefly through the eyes of Philo (but not exclusively so). Each chapter has a title consisting of a quote, usually drawn from Philo's writings, but this is not always the case. For example the final chapter is entitled "in a city not their own" and discusses the severe problems of the Jewish community in the city, which reached a temporary climax a decade or so before Philo's death. The quote

is not from Philo, but from the letter of the emperor Claudius to the Alexandrians preserved on a famous papyrus (*P. Lond.* 1912).

Although I applaud the project that the book attempts and find the result very readable and informative, there are two aspects that require critical comment. Firstly, it has to be pointed out that the very nature of the project involves the author in a great deal of speculation of the kind "Philo must have seen this," "Philo must have known that," etc. For example we read that "no doubt it was through the Museum that Philo met a number of medical academics." But Philo nowhere mentions the Museum, and indeed there is no solid evidence that the scientists of that illustrious institution were engaged in medical research at all. Sly cannot avoid discussing texts that are wrenched out of their context, but on the whole she is careful enough to indicate, esp. through use of the conditional mood, where facts stop and speculation starts. One case that I found too risky is found in the opening pages of the book. Two famous Philonic passages are rewritten so that they refer much more concretely to the Alexandrian situation than they did in the original. The unsuspecting reader, who sees the quotation marks and the reference in brackets at the end may well think that these are genuine Philonic texts. My second critical observation is that the book's documentation is rather spotty. There are no footnotes; references are given in the text. This method hampers the author in documenting her text. There is a good deal of research, much of it in French and German, which is not noted, and which could shed much extra light on Philo's situation in the Alexandria of his day.

At times the book reads a little like a novel. So let me end by disclosing that it has a happy ending. The final sentence is so delightfully phrased that I cannot resist quoting it in full (p. 180):

> It appears, then, that in his seventh decade, as the midpoint of the first century of our era approached, Alexandria was enjoying a respite from civil dispute, and our guide to the city and its affairs had retreated to his study, to enjoy his closing years in peace.

Let us hope for Philo's sake that this is what happened.

NL-2333 AE *Leiden*, Rijnsburgerweg 116 D.T. Runia

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bauer, Johannes B., *Studien zu Bibeltext und Väterexegese*, herausgegeben von Anneliese Felber (Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände 23). Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997. 296 pp. ISBN 3-460-06221-5. Price 79 DM.

Birnbaum, Ellen, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes* (Brown Judaic Studies 290 = Studia Philonica Monographs 1). Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996. xviii + 262 pp. ISBN 0-7885-0182-8. Price $39.95.

Boulhol, Pierre, *'ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΜΟΣ: La scène de reconnaissance dans l'hagiographie antique et médiévale.* Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1996. 260 pp. ISBN 2-85399-387-6. Price FFr 170.

Castagno, Adele Monaci, *Il diavolo e i suoi angeli: testi e tradizioni (secolo I-III)* (Biblioteca Patristica 28). Firenze: Nardini Editore, 1996. 507 pp. Price 58,000 Lire.

Drobner, Hubertus R., *Archaeologia Patristica: Die Schriften der Kirchenväter als Quellen der Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte: Gregor von Nyssa, Homiliae in Ecclesiasten* (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 10). Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di archeologie cristiana, 1996. x + 254 pp. ISBN 88-85991-16-5. Price 120,000 Lire.

Évieux, Pierre (ed.), *Isidore de Péluse: Tome I, Lettres 1124-1413* (Sources Chrétiennes 422). Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1997. 555 pp. ISBN 2-204-05557-3. Price 245 FFr.

Eymann, Hugo S. (ed.), *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; 21 Epistula ad Romanos, 1. Lieferung Einleitung.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1997. 80 pp. ISBN 3-451-00181-0.

Featherstone, J.M. (ed.), *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815* (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 33). Turnout: Brepols and Leuven: University Press, 1997. xxxiv + 380 pp. ISBN 2-503-40332-8. Price BFr 6500.

Gryson, Roger (ed.), *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; 12 (Pars II) Esaias, fascicule 9 Is 58,8-61,10.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1997. pp. 1441-1520. ISBN 3-451-00129-2.

Haas, Christopher, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. xviii + 494 pp. ISBN 0-8018-5377-X. Price $54.

Hoffmann, Andreas, *Augustins Schrift "De utilitate credendi": eine Analyse* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 58). Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1997. vi + 497 pp. ISBN 3-402-03963-X. Price DM 118.

Jacob of Serugh: Select Festal Homilies, Translated from Syriac and introduced by Thomas Kollamparampil, CMI, with a foreword by Sebastian P. Brock. Rome: Centre for Indian and Inter-religious studies, and Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications: 1997. 414 pp.

Lévy, C., and Pernot, L. (eds.), *Dire l'évidence* (*Philosophie et rhétorique antiques*) (Cahiers de philosophie de l'Université de Paris XII—Val de Marne 2). Paris and Montreal: Editions l'Harmattan, 1997. 448 pp. ISBN 2-7384-5024-5.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Lössl, Josef, *Intellectus Gratiae: Die erkenntnistheoretische und hermeneutische Dimension der Gnadenlehre Augustins von Hippo* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 38). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1997. xii + 501 pp. ISBN 90 04 10849 1. Price NLG 275.

Louth, Andrew, *Maximus the Confessor* (The Early Church Fathers, edited by Carol Harrison). London and New York: Routledge, 1996. ix + 230 pp. ISBN 0-415-11846-8. Price £14.99 (pb).

Luther, Andreas, *Die syrische Chronik des Josua Stylites* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 49). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. v + 309 pp. ISBN 3-11-015470-6. Price 198 DM.

Maraval, Pierre, *Le christianisme de Constantin à la conquête arabe* (Nouvelle Clio: L'histoire et ses problèmes). Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1997. lix + 460 pp. ISBN 2-13-048447-6. Price FFr 198.

Micaelli, Claudio, *Dio nel pensiero di Boezio* (Storie e Testi 4). Naples: M. D'Auria Editore, 1995. 185 pp. ISBN 88-7092-099-2.

Mirecki, Paul, and BeDuhn, Jason (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1997. x + 294 pp. ISBN 90 04 10760 6. Price NLG 186, $116.25.

Moxnes, Halvor (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996. xvi + 216 pp. ISBN 0-415-1463-99. Price £14.99 (pb).

Prokurat, Michael; Golitzin, Alexander, and Petersen, Michael D. (eds.), *Historical Dictionary of the Orthodox Church* (Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements 9). Lanham MD: Scarecrow Press, 1996. xvii + 440 pp. ISBN 0-8108-3081-7. Price $89.

Revista Theologica di Lugano: Anno II, numero 1 Maggio 1997. 167 pp. Price SFr 55.

Rufino di Aquileia Versione delle omelie di Basilio (I-III), edizione critica a cura di Carla Lo Cicero. Rome: Università Degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza": Dipartimento di Filologia Greca e Latina, 1996. xxxii + 78 pp.

Sant'Agostino Confessioni Volume V (Libri XII-XIII), Testo criticamente riveduto . . . a cura di Manlio Simonetti, Traduzione di Gioacchino Chiarini, Commento a cura di Jean Pépin, Manlio Simonetti (Scrittori Greci e Latini). Fondazione Lorenzo Valla Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1997. 393 pp. ISBN 88-04-41717-X. Price 48,000 Lire.

Sly, Dorothy I., *Philo's Alexandria.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996. xviii + 200 pp. ISBN 0-415-09679-0. Price £40.

Tabona: Revista de Preshistoria y de Arqueologia IX. Universidad de La Laguna (Tenerife): Servicio de Publicaciones, 1997. 437 pp. ISSN 0213-2818.

Turner, John D., and McGuire, Anne (eds.), *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years: Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 44). Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill, 1997. xviii + 531 pp. ISBN 90 04 10824 6. Price NLG 300.

TERTULLIAN AND REBEKAH:
A RE-READING OF AN "ANTI-JEWISH" ARGUMENT IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

BY

GEOFFREY D. DUNN

I

Rebekah, the wife of Isaac and mother of Esau and Jacob, is mentioned on nine occasions in the writings of Tertullian. Four of those references are to Rebekah veiling herself the first time she saw Isaac (Gen. 24:64-65);[1] one is to Isaac's denial of Rebekah as his wife (Gen. 26:7);[2] and four are to Rebekah as mother of Esau and Jacob (Gen. 25:22-26).[3] This paper is concerned with the last four references and their place in early Christian anti-Jewish polemic. Rosemary Radford Ruether has written with regard to Patristic *Adversus Iudaeos* literature:

> But throughout these writings from the second to the sixth century the arguments themselves remain fairly continuous and fixed.[4]

She suggests that one such example of a constant interpretation in early Christianity is with regard to Gen. 25:23: the younger people, who are the Gentile Church, overcome the elder people, the Jews.[5] The aim of this paper is to investigate the interpretation of Gen. 25:23 in Tertullian in particular and in earlier Christian literature in general. The argument of this paper is that, although these early Christian writers shared common material, they each employed that material in ways that suited their own individual approaches and each contributed their own unique insights and

---

[1] Tert. *de Cor.* 4.2; Tert. *Or.* 22.10; Tert. *de Virg.* 11.3 (twice).

[2] Tert. *de Cult.* 2.2.6—found only in the *Codex Parisinus latinus 1622, saec. ix* (*Agobardinus*).

[3] Tert. *adv. Iud.* 1.3,4; Tert. *de Pud.* 8.8; Tert. *de An.* 26.2.

[4] R.R. Ruether, "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition in the Church Fathers: The Exegesis of Christian Anti-Judaism," in P.E. Szarmach (ed.), *Aspects of Jewish Culture in the Middle Ages* (Albany 1979) 29.

[5] *Ibid.* 35 and 48 n. 14.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

perspectives. To ignore these finer points of individuality is to run the risk of over-generalisation or over-simplification.

II

In the *narratio* of his own work, now entitled *adversus Iudaeos*, Tertullian quoted God's promise to Rebekah in Genesis 25:23:

> *Duae gentes in utero tuo sunt, et duo populi de utero tuo dividentur, et populus populum superabit, et maior serviet minori.*[6]

He interpreted this statement typologically: the elder child represented the Jews and the younger represented the Christians. Tertullian provided two reasons for this interpretation: the Jews were earlier in time than the Christians as a people and the Jews had access through the Law to God's grace earlier than did the Christians (*adv. Iud.* 1.5). From this he concluded not only that the Christians *also* had access to divine grace, but that, because of Jewish infidelity, *only* the Christians now had that access (*adv. Iud.* 1.6-7). In other words, the Christians had overcome the Jews and thus the promise made to Rebekah had been fulfilled at last. This becomes the *partitio* (*adv. Iud.* 1.8) which Tertullian developed into the unfolding arguments of the remainder of the work.

The references in *de Pudicitia* and *de Anima* to Rebekah's twins are briefer and occur as proofs for other points Tertullian wished to make.

In *de Anima* the reference to the twins wrestling within Rebekah's womb and to Jacob, while still in the womb (*i.e.*, before he was actually born), grasping the foot of his newly-emerged, elder sibling, Esau, was taken as proof that, even before they were born or had taken breath,[7] infants had a soul (*de An.* 26.3).

In *de Pudicitia* he was arguing against forgiveness for the Christian who sinned after baptism and he felt the need to counter the interpretation of the Lukan parable of the prodigal son (Lk. 15:11-32) that saw the younger son who received forgiveness as the Christian and, consequently, the elder son as representing the Jews (*de Pud.* 8.3). He countered by attempting to

---

[6] Tert. *adv. Iud.* 1.4: "'Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples shall be divided from thy bowels, and people shall overcome people, and the greater shall serve the less.'" (Eng. trans. from A. Roberts & J. Donaldson [rev. A.C. Cox], *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 3: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian* [Grand Rapids, Mich. 1885]).

[7] A reference to the Stoic and Platonic positions Tertullian was countering that the body and soul only came together at birth.

prove that the elder son of the parable, who was faithful to the father, could not be an allegorical representation of the Jews because of their unfaithfulness, even though they were older by adoption (*de Pud.* 8.4—*Licet enim et filius audiat Iudaeus et maior, quia prior in adoptione . . .*). Instead, the elder son of the parable was a figure for the Christian (*de Pud.* 8.4-8). However, although the elder son was seen by Tertullian as such a figure, this did not mean that the Jews would be the younger son. The younger son could not represent the Jews as that would be contrary to the prophecy made to Rebekah about her twins (*de Pud.* 8.8). Certainly Tertullian would not have liked somebody to point out that, if the Jews did not correspond to the younger son of the Lukan parable because that would be contrary to their place in the Rebekah prophecy, then, logically, the Christians could not be taken as the elder son of the Lukan parable because that would be contrary to *their* place in the Rebekah prophecy. Tertullian was aware of the limitations of allegorical interpretation,[8] but drew the line to suit himself: the Jews could not be the younger son of Lk. 15 but the Christians could be the elder.

Later, he suggested that the pagans must be the younger son (*de Pud.* 9.14), and all of this was meant to prove that forgiveness was offered but once by God. What is of interest here is that the reference to Rebekah is made merely in passing:

> *Multo aptius Christianum maiori et Iudaeum minori filio adaequassent secundum fidei comparationem, si ordo utriusque populi ab utero Rebeccae designatus permitteret demutationem. Nisi quod et clausula refragaretur.*[9]

Obviously Tertullian presumed that whoever read this reference, and the earlier one about the Jews being older by adoption, would understand their meaning without any further explanation. This provides a possible connection with *adversus Iudaeos*. It could well be argued that Tertullian felt no need to amplify his reference to Rebekah and who her twins represented

---

[8] Tert. *de Pud.* 8.9: "*Ita etsi quaedam facient, sed aliis contra sapientibus interimitur exemplorum peraequatio.*"

[9] Tert. *de Pud.* 8.8: "Much more aptly would they have matched the Christian with the elder, and the Jew with the younger son, 'according to the analogy of faith,' if the order of each people as intimated from Rebecca's womb permitted the inversion: only that (in that case) the concluding paragraph would oppose them . . ." (Eng. trans. from A. Roberts & J. Donaldson [rev. A.C. Cox], *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 4: Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodianus; Origen, Parts First and Second* [Grand Rapids, Mich. 1885]).

in *de Pudicitia* because he had done so in his earlier work, *adversus Iudaeos*. Such an interpretation would be a small contribution in support of the chronology established by Timothy Barnes that places *adversus Iudaeos* early in Tertullian's literary career and *de Pudicitia* at its end.[10] Given the controversy about the authenticity and integrity of *adversus Iudaeos*,[11] this connection between the two works would amount to a supporting argument in favour of the authenticity of at least the early part of *adversus Iudaeos*. On the basis of the brevity and lack of explanation of the reference to Rebekah in *de Pudicitia*, it would seem fair to presume that Tertullian would have explained it elsewhere. Given that in the rest of his extant works no explanation was forthcoming, except in *adversus Iudaeos*, again it would seem fair to conclude that this explanation in *adversus Iudaeos* was authentically Tertullian's. This suggestion would achieve a degree of certainty if it could be shown that the typological interpretation of the twins, presumed in *de Pudicitia* and explained in *adversus Iudaeos*, was original to Tertullian or not known to Christian theology in Carthage. It is to this question we turn now.

III

The obvious and traditional interpretation of this passage was that Esau, the elder, was the eponym of the Edomites, or foreigners in general, and that Jacob, the younger, was the eponym of the Jews, the people of Israel. Tertullian's identification of the Jews with the elder son was to run counter to this tradition.

The Yahwist message from the narrative in Genesis itself was that the promise made to Rebekah about the younger overcoming the elder (Gen. 25:23) was fulfilled indeed in the life of Jacob himself (considered as an individual rather than as a nation) through his obtaining Esau's birthright (Gen. 25:29-34) and cheating Esau of Isaac's blessing (Gen. 27:1-40). Further,

---

[10] T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford 1971) 55.

[11] See A. Kroymann's notes in *Tertulliani Opera, Pars II, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, 2 (Turnhout 1954) 1338; G. Quispel, *De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem* (Utrecht 1943) 61-79; E. Noeldechen, *Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians, Texte u. Unters.*, v. 2 (Leipzig 1888); *idem, Tertullians Schrift gegen die Juden auf Einheit, Echtheit, Entstehung geprüft, Text u. Unters.*, xii.2 (Leipzig 1894); G. Säflund, *De pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians* (Lund 1955) 122 ff.; A.L. Williams, Adversus Judaeos: *A Bird's-Eye View of Christian* Apologiae *until the Renaissance* (Cambridge 1935) 43-45; H. Tränkle, *Q.S.F. Tertulliani*, Adversus Iudaeos: *mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar* (Wiesbaden 1964) liii-lxvii; T.D. Barnes, *op. cit.* 53.

that the individuals also represented nations, and that the nations referred to in Gen. 25:23 were accepted by the Yahwist author to be the Edomites, in the person of Esau, and the Israelites, in the person of Jacob, can also clearly be demonstrated from Genesis itself (Gen. 32:29; 35:10; 36:1). Other traditions in Israel, in particular the prophetic tradition, also saw events in the life of Jacob as prefiguring or representing events in the whole nation of Israel (Hos. 12; Jer. 9:3).[12] Jacob was the "typological prototype for *all* Israel," as Fishbane has noted.[13] He would go as far as to say:

> It would appear that for the prophet, in so far as the individual Jacob-Israel is the ancestor of Israel, his behaviour has to some degree *determined* the behaviour of his descendants. Indeed, because of the eponymous link between the person Israel and the nation, the parallelism drawn between the actions is not a mere rhetorical trope, but drives deeper into the very "nature" of Israel. The nation is not just "like" its ancestor, says Hosea, but *is* its ancestor in fact—in name and in deed.[14]

Scholars today, both Jewish[15] and Christian,[16] continue to recognise that the authors of Genesis accepted that the nation dependent on the younger twin was Israel.

The *Book of Jubilees* retold the story of the birth of the twins, making Abraham a central figure. He decided that Jacob would be the one to transmit all the blessings he himself had received from God (Jub. 19.23), and it was Abraham who told Rebekah that Jacob would be chosen by God to be God's own people (Jub. 19.18). There is nothing to suggest any

---

[12] The question of how God could be party to or approve of the underhanded if not immoral actions of Jacob and Rebekah has long been one of primary interest to scholars of the Jacob cycle, Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern. See M. Maher, "The Transfer of a Birthright: Justifying the Ancestors," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 8 (1984) 1-24, for a presentation of Rabbinic and Patristic interpretation; R.P. Bulka, "The Selling of the Birthright: Making Sense of a Perplexing Episode," *Jewish Biblical Quarterly* 9 (1990-91) 100-104; L. Teugels, "'A Strong Woman, Who Can Find?' A Study of Characterization in Genesis 24, with some Perspectives on the General Presentation of Isaac and Rebekah in the Genesis Narratives," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 63 (1994) 89-104.

[13] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 377.

[14] *Ibid.* 378. *Cf.* R.J. Clifford, "Genesis 25:19-34," *Interpretation* 45 (1991) 397-398: "The stories are not allegories with a one-to-one correspondence of individual and nation. The human actors, however, are ancestors who somehow include and prefigure their descendants."

[15] *E.g.* B. Jacob, *The First Book of the Bible: Genesis* (abr. ed. & trans. by E.I. Jacob & W. Jacob) (New York 1974 [Eng. ed.]) 167.

[16] *E.g.* R.J. Clifford, *op. cit.* 400.

other interpretation than that Jacob stood for the people of Israel. Josephus also retold the story, but with Abraham dead by the time Rebekah conceived and with Isaac the one who consulted God and received the prophecy (Jos. *J.A.* 1.18.1). Once again, though, there is nothing to contradict the traditional Jewish interpretation. Philo, who saw in the Scriptures both a literal (τὸ ῥητόν) and symbolic (τὸ συμβολικόν) meaning, and admitted to allegorising (ἀλληγοροῦντες), considered part of the Jacob cycle in his *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin.* Although he was not explicit, it is clear that Philo identified the younger son with the people of Israel because he noted that, in God's prophecy to Rebekah, reference was not made to the name of the twins but to the nations that would be their descendants (Philo, *QG* 157).[17]

Later rabbinic Midrash on the Jacob cycle presents difficulties for one who wishes to comment on the history of interpretation. *Genesis Rabbah* in its final form dates from the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century A.D., although it most probably contains earlier material.[18] In particular, it addressed problems the Jews faced in the light of Constantine's conversion. The point here is that it is consistent with the Jewish tradition outlined briefly above. *Genesis Rabbah* interpreted the pre-natal story of Esau and Jacob allegorically, with Esau representing Rome, attracted to idolatry, and Jacob representing Israel, attracted to synagogues and study houses (*Gen. Rab.* 63.6-7).[19]

In the light of this Jewish tradition that can be seen from the time of the redaction of the Jacob cycle in Genesis onwards, it may be asked what interpretations did the earliest Christians provide about the story of Rebekah's pregnancy? Paul made reference to it in Romans 9:10-13. In the context of the surrounding chapters it is evident that Paul accepted the identification of Jacob, the younger son, with the people of Israel, *i.e.*, his interpretation was entirely consistent with the Jewish tradition. In its immediate context, Paul's reference to Rebekah, as well as his reference to God's promise of Isaac to Abraham (Rom. 9:7-9), was as an example of, or as proof of, God's freedom of election (Rom. 9:18). Paul took up the point that God was not limited by primogeniture but had the freedom to choose the younger twin.

---

[17] See also Philo, *Sacr. Abel et Cain* 2.4; 4.17; Philo, *Cong.* 23.129.

[18] J. Neusner, *The Midrash: An Introduction* (Northvale, N.J. 1990) 142-148.

[19] *Idem* (trans.), *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis—A New American Translation, volume 2: Parashiyyot Thirty-Four through Sixty-Seven on Genesis 8:15 to 28:9* (Atlanta 1985), 354. Here Neusner expresses his opinion that Esau represented Rome.

He continued that God's choice of the Gentiles for salvation, prefigured in the prophets (Rom. 9:25-29), was equally free (Rom. 9:24). Israel's disobedience had not nullified God's free election of them (in Abraham and Jacob) (Rom. 11:1-2), for it had given God the opportunity to be merciful to the Gentiles (Rom. 11:11-28). A remnant of Israel had remained faithful (Rom. 11:25). Israel was still loved by God because of the election (Rom. 11:28), and Israel's disobedience was so they too might experience God's mercy as the Gentiles had (Rom. 11:31-32).[20] Given that Paul returned on several occasions in these chapters to the election of Israel, the mention of God's free choice of Jacob was still in accord with the traditional interpretation of Jacob with Israel. On a careful reading of Romans itself, Clifford's assertion: "For Paul, the 'younger' Gentiles were now chosen and God was not to be questioned."[21] and Schreckenberg's: "Diese Stelle und ihre christliche Deutung auf Kirche (Jakob) und Synagoge (Esau), eine Deutung, die sich auf Paulus, Röm 9,12, berufen konnte, kam schon in der Kirchenväterzeit zu allergrößter Bedeutung."[22] cannot be maintained without qualification. Paul did not identify Jacob, the "younger," with the Gentiles; the call of the Gentiles was a further call (the grafting of the new branch onto the old olive tree—Rom. 11:17-24) that only happened after chosen Israel disobeyed God; it was not one that originated with the prophecy to Rebekah.

---

[20] See D.G. Johnson, "The Structure and Meaning of Romans 11," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984) 91-103; J.A. Fisher, "Dissent Within a Religious Community: Romans 9-11," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 10 (1980) 105-110; C.E.B. Cranfield, "Romans 9:30-10:4," *Interpretation* 34 (1980) 70-74; *idem, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, vol. 2, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh 1979) esp. 476-479; B. Byrne, *Reckoning with Romans: A Contemporary Reading of Paul's Gospel* (Wilmington, Del. 1986) 184-206; J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Letter to the Romans," in R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer & R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1990) 856-862; E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. G.W. Bromiley) (London 1980 [Eng. ed.]) 260-318; W.D. Davies, "Paul and the People of Israel," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978) 4-39; N. Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series no. 45 (Sheffield 1990) 264-275; J.C. Beker, "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans," in G.W.E. Nickelsburg & G.W. MacRae (eds.), *Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (Philadelphia 1986) 10-16.

[21] R.J. Clifford, *op. cit.* 401.

[22] H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11.Jh)* (Frankfurt am Main 1990) 63.

IV

We may now consider the references to Rebekah and her twins in Patristic literature prior to Tertullian. *1 Clement* mentioned Jacob as the father of the twelve tribes of Israel and of having fled from his brother and gone to Laban (*1 Clem.* 31), but there is no mention of the prophecy of their birth nor, therefore, any contribution to the interpretation of this allegorical representation. The letter *ad Diognetum* likewise contains nothing about the prophecy to Rebekah, neither does Polycarp nor Ignatius of Antioch. The Nag Hammadi material too reveals nothing relevant for our purposes here.

In the *Epistle of Barnabas* is found the first extant interpretation of the prophecy to Rebekah where the younger son is not identified as the people of Israel as commonly understood. The epistle cites Gen. 25:23, the prophecy of God to Rebekah (*Barn.* 13.2).[23] The author used this text as part of the answer to the question about whether the covenant belonged to "us" or to "them" (*Barn.* 13.1). Another text is also cited: Gen. 48:18-19 (Jacob's blessing of Joseph's sons Ephraim and Manasseh) as further proof, although the author was selective in how he cited this (*Barn.* 13.4-6).[24] The Rebekah passage was presented for allegorical interpretation, for the author invited his readers to identify who Rebekah, Isaac and the people referred to through the two sons were.

As the author did not elucidate, one must examine the context in which these proof-texts were offered to determine whom the two sons represented. The question of the letter's provenance and dating need not detain us, because the opinion of a number of scholars that it originated in Alexandria in the late first (or even early second) century A.D. may be accepted.[25]

---

[23] J.C. Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Reihe 2; 94 (Tübingen 1994) 162-165, notes the ways in which *Barn.* has altered or inherited alterations to the Genesis story.

[24] *Ibid.* 162 notes that the combination of these two stories is not found in any other Christian writing and is only found in Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* 3.29.88-3.30.94.

[25] L.W. Barnard, "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas—a Document of Early Egyptian Christianity," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 44 (1958) 101-107; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (London 1984) 121; B.A. Pearson, "Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations," in B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, vol. 1 of Studies in Antiquity and Christianity (Philadelphia 1986) 150-151; R.M. Grant, "Theological Education at Alexandria," in B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring, *op. cit.* 181; R.S. MacLennan, *Early Christian Texts on Jews and Judaism*, vol. 194 of Brown Judaic Studies (Atlanta 1990) 21; J.C. Paget, *op. cit.* 9-42; *cf.* A.F.J. Klijn, "Jewish

The question of *Barn.* 13.1, about the identity of the people of the covenant, had first been raised at *Barn.* 4.6, where the author expressed his opposition to those who argued "that the covenant is both theirs and ours" (ὅτι ἡ διαθήκη ἐκείνων καὶ ἡμῶν). The author's opposition to that view was so the readers of the letter might not misinterpret God's intentions, as had been done in the past, not only with regard to the covenant, but with regard to sacrifice (ch. 3), fasting (ch. 4), circumcision (ch. 9),[26] food laws (ch. 10), the Sabbath (ch. 15) and the Temple (ch. 16) as well.

The contrast between "us" and "them" is a feature of this letter. Many commentators make the simple identification that "us" refers to Christians and "them" refers to Jews.[27] It is partly on the basis of the identification, presumably, that William Frend is able to write: "After circa A.D. 100 there was less of a tendency for Christians to claim to be Israel and more of a tendency to contrast Christianity and Judaism as separate religions. Christianity claimed to be heir to the universalist claims of Judaism."[28] However, nowhere in the epistle did the author make such an explicit identification; words like "Jew" and "Christian" were not in the author's vocabulary. A closer attention to the contrast in the epistle reveals that it expressed the view which Frend characterised as belonging to the earlier,

---

Christianity in Egypt," in B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring, *op. cit.* 166; K. Wengst, *Schriften des Urchristentums: Didache, Barnabasbrief, zweiter Klemensbrief, Schriften an Diognet* (Darmstadt 1984) 115; P. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: l'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (Paris 1961) 22-24; M.B. Shukster & P. Richardson, "Temple and *Bet Ha-midrash* in the Epistle of Barnabas," in S.G. Wilson (ed.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, vol. 2: Separation and Polemic* (Ontario 1986) 17-31; J. Alverez, "Apostolic Writings and the Roots of Anti-Semitism," *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975) 69-76.

[26] See J.N.B.C. Paget, "Barnabas 9:4: A Peculiar Verse on Circumcision," *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991) 242-254, who argues that although there was a Jewish tradition of spiritualising circumcision, *Barn.*'s argument here was his own. As will be discussed below, Paget's view that *Barn.* was anti-Jewish needs qualification.

[27] S. Lowy, "The Confutation of Judaism in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 11 (1960) 1; W. Horbury, "Jewish-Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr," in J.D.G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: the Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (Tübingen 1992) 315; R.S. MacLennan, *op. cit.* 24; J.C. Paget, *op. cit.* 52; A.L. Williams, *op. cit.* 14. Perhaps one of the clearest statements of this view is C.M. Williamson, "The 'Adversus Judaeos' Tradition in Christian Theology," *Encounter* 39 (1978) 275: "Here for the first time in post-biblical Christian history we find a Gentile Christian appropriating the prophetic criticism of Jews by Jews on *behalf of a Gentile Christianity* and using it against Jews." (emphasis added). Also I have to disagree strongly with the view of J. Alvarez, *op. cit.* 73, who argued that the author avoided the term Jew because it was abhorrent to him.

[28] W.H.C. Frend, *op. cit.* 124.

first phase (A.D. 65 to 100) of the sub-apostolic period: "All Christianity at this stage was 'Jewish Christianity.' But it was Israel with a difference."[29] In other words, the argument here is that the *Epistle of Barnabas* did not so much contrast Jew with Christian or Judaism with Christianity as old people of the covenant with new people of the covenant or one type of Jew with another type. Is there really any difference?

Indeed there is. The old people of the covenant comprised all those who had misunderstood God's intentions from the establishment of the covenant until the present and who therefore had never been the people of God (*Barn.* 4.7-8—ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι οὕτως εἰς τέλος ἀπώλεσαν αὐτὴν λαβόντος ἤδη τοῦ Μωϋσέως . . . καὶ συνετρίβη αὐτῶν ἡ διαθήκη . . .). The new people (*Barn.* 5.7—τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινόν) comprised those who had understood God's intentions after the time when the covenant had been broken *first* until the present. The new people were the only one, true people; the old people never had been.[30] For the author of the epistle, it was the people who changed not covenants. The "old" covenant was not replaced by a "new" one at the time of Jesus. The covenant had ended even before Moses descended from Sinai (*Barn.* 4.7-8; 14.2-4) because the people were not worthy to receive it. As Simon has stated with regard to the covenant with Moses: "The entire development of Israel's history from that point onwards is quite meaningless, except as an illustration of what the Sinai apostasy involved. It cannot be for a Christian in any sense sacred history."[31] But that end was temporary. What had been abolished (*Barn.* 2.6—κατήργησεν) was not an "old" covenant but its old misapplication.[32] The covenant of Jesus was the same as that of Moses; it was revived rather than replaced (*Barn.* 4.8; 5.1-2; 14.5-6).[33]

Thus, there is a sense in *Barnabas* that no covenant existed in the time between Moses and Jesus: those who thought they had it (but had really lost it) could do no right, for they lived in their misunderstanding (*Barn.* 2.4-5,9; 3.4-5; 4.14), while the prophets prepared for the coming of the Christ by announcing what true understanding would involve (*Barn.* 2.10;

---

[29] *Ibid.* 123.

[30] When *Barn.* used the word "Israel" (4.14; 5.2,8; 6.7; 8.1,3; 9.2; 12.2,5; 16.5) he was referring to it in an historical sense. The term was not applied directly to "them."

[31] M. Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)* (trans. H. McKeating) (Oxford 1986 [Eng. ed.]) 87.

[32] *Barn.* 2.6 mentioned ὁ καινὸς νόμος and in the context of these early chapters it does not mean a new covenant but a new way of living the one covenant.

[33] M. Simon, *op. cit.* 88, notes the telling flaw in *Barn.*'s argument—the omission of Ex. 34:1-4 (the giving of the second tablets to Moses).

3.6; 7.1-12.11). This true understanding was a spiritual, not a literal application of the covenant.[34] For *Barnabas* the "new" covenant was not really new but rather the correct application of the "old," which had never had a chance.[35] The author wrote of another pattern (*Barn.* 6.11—ἄλλον τύπον), a second fashioning or refashioning (*Barn.* 6.13—δευτέραν πλάσιν; 6.14—ἀναπεπλάσμεθα) rather than another covenant. It was to prevent the people of the *renewed* covenant from falling into the same pattern of misunderstanding, as had the original people of the covenant, that the author wrote (*Barn.* 2.10; 3.10; 4.1-2).[36] The prophecy to Rebekah was seen as the earliest prophecy that the original recipients of the covenant would be replaced by others. What may have made the prophecy (and the one of Jacob to Joseph's sons) significant was that it was given before the rebelliousness of those first recipients.

The proposal in this paper is that the author of *Barnabas* did not see two distinct religions (Judaism and Christianity) or even two covenants (old and new) but that he saw a struggle between two peoples claiming to be the one, true, legitimate heirs of the one, true covenant (*Barn.* 6.19).[37] He did not use the terms "Jews" and "Christians" but "us" and "them." "Them" referred to the rebellious people of the Exodus and their spiritual descendants. "Us" referred to the authentic Israel, the followers of Jesus who interpreted God's requirements correctly.[38] That the language of "Jews"

---

[34] See particularly *Barn.* 12 for the clearest example: the spiritual interpretation of circumcision. J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford 1985) 158, points out that *Barn.* was not the first to have spiritualised the Law. Philo had criticised allegorising Jews who had abandoned literal observance (Philo, *Mig. Abr.* 89-93).

[35] This is the point made by S. Lowy, *op. cit.* 1, when he contrasted Justin and *Barn.* on fasting: "By this device [contrasting 'us' and 'them'] he [Barnabas] proves his racial thesis: the Jews misunderstood the law when applying it in its literal sense. Fasting was never intended to be a practical institution, and the verses were meant to bear a 'spiritual' interpretation, which alone was originally intended to be the true exegesis of the Law."

[36] Indeed, if the author feared that there was a chance that some in his community would imitate the way of misunderstanding, it suggests that that way was attractive if not familiar to them.

[37] J.C. Paget, *op. cit.* 52: ". . . there is only one covenant, that which the Jews lost by worshipping the golden calf, and which the Christians have gained through Christ's saving work on the cross . . ." I would not use the terms "Jews" and "Christians" here but, as I believe *Barn.* saw it, those who clung to the defunct Mosaic version of the covenant and those who belonged to the authentic covenant as revived by Jesus.

[38] W. Horbury, *op. cit.* 325, distinguishes between Jews and Christian Judaizers. The argument of this paper partly is that *both* could be "them" for *Barn.*

and "Christians" was not employed may be an indication that there were still a significant enough number of Christian Jews in the community.[39] Certainly the way one interprets "us" and "them" in *Barnabas* will determine the extent to which one believes the Christians and the Jews had gone their separate ways by this time.

Support for this interpretation can be found in the mentioning of the prophecy to Rebekah, where the author of the letter indicated that the prophecy was in reference to who was the legitimate heir to the covenant (in the singular) (*Barn.* 13.1—ἡ διαθήκη), not to a struggle between two covenants. The twins in the womb represent the false heirs and the true heirs rather than non-Jew and Jew or non-Israel and Israel (as Hellenistic Judaism and Jewish Midrash understood it) or even Jew and Christian (as Tertullian saw it). Thus the point that some commentators find so worthy of comment—that *Barnabas* is so anti-Judaic in content yet so Jewish in method[40]—is not so remarkable, for the author was not against Judaism but rather against false Judaism (or, for true or authentic Judaism, which was found in the followers of Jesus). It would seem that *Barnabas* was composed at a time when "Jew" and "follower of Jesus" had not yet become mutually exclusive terms. Jewish people were not excluded from being "us" provided that they were followers of Jesus. Perhaps the scholar who holds the most similar view is Prigent, who described *Barnabas* as being anti-cultic rather than anti-Jewish.[41] The point at issue is how one defines terms like "Jew" and "Judaism."[42] Thus, the view of Barnard that "the Jewish

---

[39] Such a position would be strengthened by an early dating of *Barn.* (under Vespasian or Nerva) rather than a later (under Hadrian). See P. Richardson & M.B. Shukster, "Barnabas, Nerva, and the Yavnean Rabbis," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 34 (1983) 31-55.

[40] W. Horbury, *op. cit.* 318.

[41] P. Prigent, *op. cit.* 29-83. On 83, he concludes: "Ce n'est plus là le spiritualisme des *Testimonia* mais une attitude plus radicale, il ne s'agit plus d'opposer le judaïsme au christianisme, mais l'humanité naturelle à la nouvelle création." The review of this work by R.A. Kraft, *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 13 (1962) 405, notes that Prigent generally has avoided a term that is "conventional and misleading." *Cf.* J.C. Paget, *op. cit.* 56-57, who rejects this because he sees *Barn.* as being more than anti-cultic. While this can be accepted, it does not mean that *Barn.* was anti-Jewish. More accurately, I am arguing, he was against one type of Judaism.

[42] Only if the term "Jew" meant that it excluded Christians could then one understand *Barn.* as being anti-Jewish. The crucial question is the extent to which, by the time *Barn.* was written, Judaism and Christianity were mutually exclusive entities, rather than overlapping ones. D. Georgi, "The Early Church: Internal Migration or New

nation was therefore inferior to the Christian Church, as the types indicate,"[43] is not sufficiently nuanced.

The argument of Johnson against those who have attempted to explain away the presence of anti-Jewish polemic in the New Testament—"These approaches are theologically motivated and are anachronistic. They isolate 'Christianity' over against 'Judaism' as though each was a well-defined entity when the polemic was written."[44]—can, I believe, be used against those who argue for the presence of anti-Jewish *qua* anti-Jewish polemic in *Barnabas*, if one accepts that this community still had the presence of a significant number of what we may term Christian Jews. The suggestion that the author himself may have been of Jewish origin supports this overall position.[45]

Certainly "us" would have contained most of the Christians whether of Jewish or Gentile origins[46] (with the exception of Judaising Christians whether of Gentile or Jewish origin)[47] and "them" would have contained

---

Religion," *Harvard Theological Review* 88 (1995) 35-68, focuses on the pluralism of first-century Judaism, of which Christianity was a part.

[43] L.W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* (Oxford 1966) 126. His point, that *Barn.* does not seem to have drawn directly on Rom., is sound.

[44] L.T. Johnson, "The New Testament's anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989) 422.

[45] L.W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* 47, identifies the author as a converted rabbi. The Jewishness of *Barn.*'s Christian community is not to be downplayed. *Cf.* H. Schreckenberg, *op. cit.* 174: "Der Verfasser war wohl eher Heidenchrist als Judenchrist. Er versucht, unter radikaler Eliminierung des Judentums das Alte Testament alter Geschichtlichkeit zu entkleiden und ausschließlich für die Kirche zu reklamieren."

[46] *Barn.* 12.11 (citing Is. 45:1); 13.7 (citing Gen. 17:5) and 14.7-8 (citing Is. 42:6-7; 49:6) refer to the calling of the nations (the Gentiles) and from this it is clear that "us" included a significant number of Christian Gentiles. It would be wrong though simply because of this to conclude that "us" were *exclusively* of a Gentile origin. Thus, R.A. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers, vol. 3: Barnabas and the Didache* (New York 1965) 39, goes too far when he concludes that the author and his community were non-Jewish because "the community is expressly identified with uncircumcised Gentiles (13:7; 14:5-8; cf. 3:6; 16:7-9)." The reference to τὰ ἔθνη in *Barn.* 16.2 is to the heathen and was not used in a positive sense at all.

[47] These would be those at *Barn.* 4.6 who claimed the covenant belong both to "us" and "them," whom K. Wengst, *op. cit.* 112-14, described collectively as *Normalchristentum.* They are normal only from our perspective, not *Barn.*'s. Wengst argues that it was this group, rather than Jews in general, who posed a real problem for *Barn. Cf.* M. Mach, "Justin Martyr's *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo* and the Development of Christian Anti-Judaism," in O. Limor & G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemic*

most of the Jews (with the exception of the Christian Jews).[48] That *Barnabas* did not use the terms "Jews" and "Christians" is understood in this paper as an indicator that he found these terms unhelpful or they were not yet available to him in distinguishing who the twins of Rebekah were. In other words, a sizeable number of Christian Jews in the community would mean that *Barnabas* had to explain the struggle between the twins as the struggle between the non-authentic and the authentic people of the covenant. On the other hand, that the author wrote about the real heirs to the covenant

---

between Christians and Jews (Tübingen 1996) 27, who believes that it is by no means clear that Judaisers were a worry to *Barn.* P. Richardson & M.B. Skukster, *op. cit.* 38-39, identify those referred to in *Barn.* 4.6 as Jewish Christians (in this paper termed Christian Jews—see next note). S.G. Wilson, "Gentile Judaizers," *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992) 611-612, raises the possibility that they were Gentile Judaisers.

[48] J.C. Paget, *op. cit.* 56, comes close to this position when he wrote: "Up to that date [A.D. 115] Jews constituted a significant force in that area [Alexandria/Egypt], and could not possibly have been ignored by Christians, *particularly as many Christians probably hailed from a Jewish background,* and the Jewish community was much more numerous than the Christian." (emphasis added). Also, L.W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* 52 and 126: "The 'former people' were the Jews who had lost the privileges of the covenant; 'this people' were the Christians (both Jews and Gentiles)." Although on 134 he emphasises the anti-Jewish nature of *Barn.* as he sees it. Surely it would be too much to expect that the Christians of Jewish origin no longer thought of themselves as being in any way Jewish? That Paget has not really considered the point he seems to have made is clear on 58 when he discussed "the possibility of a movement towards Judaism." Might it not be more an issue of how far some Christians had moved *away from* rather than towards Judaism? B.A. Pearson, *op. cit.* 150, accepts that a split between Jews and Christians was not complete until A.D. 115-117. See B.J. Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a Hypothetical Definition," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7 (1976) 46-57; A.F.J. Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity," *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974) 419-431 and L. Gaston, "Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers," in S.G. Wilson (ed.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, vol. 2: Separation and Polemic* (Ontario 1986) 34-35; *cf.* S.K. Riegel, "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978) 410-15; R. Murray, "Defining Judaeo-Christianity," *Heythrop Journal* 15 (1974) 303-310; G. Quispel, "The Discussion of Judaic Christianity," *Vigiliae Christianae* 22 (1968) 81-93. Given the disagreement about terms it is important for the reader to be aware of my definitions. "Christian Jew" is used here to denote a Jewish person who becomes a Christian. "Jewish Christian" or, perhaps more helpfully, "Judaising Christian" denotes a Christian, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, who advocated a closer adherence to Jewish religious law and custom than became the Christian norm. To be consistent one ought to refer to "Christian Gentiles" rather than "Gentile Christians" for those of a pagan origin who became Christian (the latter term being reserved for those, like Paul, who advocated a minimal adherence to Jewish traditions). Only as more Christians were born into Christian families did dropping these adjectives make sense.

rather than, say, the real Israel, may be an indication that a growing number of Christian Gentiles made that identification no longer appropriate. This cannot be proven because of the paucity of evidence but it must remain a possibility.

Paget has put forward the view that *Barnabas* contains a somewhat clumsy attempt at transforming the normal interpretation of the Rebekah prophecy to suit the author's perspective. In *Barn.* 13.1 "them" (εἰς ἐκείνους) refers to the "former people" (ὁ πρῶτος), while "us" (ἡμᾶς) refers to "this people" (οὗτος ὁ λαός), which Paget takes as an indication that the author was quoting his source that the Jews were the first people, yet in *Barn.* 13.6 the author referred to τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἶναι πρῶτον (the new interpretation which for Paget asserted that the Christians not the Jews should be first).[49] This is clumsy only if the reference to πρῶτον in *Barn.* 13.6 was used chronologically rather than in rank order of importance. Paget's point, though, that for *Barnabas*, there was only ever one group who belonged to God, stands.

It is hoped that this new reading of *Barnabas*, particularly the Rebekah passage, addresses the concerns expressed by Lowy: "Scholars have paid very little attention to Barnabas' exclusive usage of the words 'they' and 'we' instead of Jews (including Jewish-Christians) and Gentiles."[50] If one may interpret *Barnabas*' interpretation of the Rebekah prophecy, it is argued in this paper that the author would have seen Jacob as the father of true believers, or the true people of the covenant, not simply Jews. The choice of a phrase like κληρονόμοι τῆς διαθήκης[51] was deliberate, for *Barnabas* had not yet made a distinction between Christian and Jew as later Christian writers would. Perhaps *Barnabas* was written on the very cusp of a clear and permanent division emerging, rather than some time after.

Although it is recognised generally that he knew and used *Barnabas* as one of his sources,[52] Justin Martyr, when he came to write his *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, lived in a changed environment. By the middle of the second century A.D., as the number of Christian Jews declined and the vast

---

[49] J.C. Paget, *op. cit.* 163-165.

[50] S. Lowy, *op. cit.* 29.

[51] *Barn.* 6.19; 13.1,6; 14.6.

[52] M. Mach, *op. cit.* 28; M. Simon, *op. cit.* 151; O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study of Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden 1987) 110-13, concludes that Justin never copied an Old Testament quotation from *Barn. Cf.* M. von Engelhardt, *Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der katholischen Glaubenslehre* (Erlangen 1978) 375.

majority of Christians were of pagan origins, a clear distinction had emerged between Christians and Jews.[53] This is evident in Justin's work with a clarity that is lacking in *Barnabas*.

At many points in the dialogue Justin referred to ἡμᾶς τὰ ἔθνη (*Dial.* 122.5) or otherwise indicated that most Christians were of Gentile origin,[54] in contrast to the Jews who were for him a distinct nation.[55] This universal dimension to God's people is much more apparent and received much greater emphasis in Justin than in *Barnabas*. For Justin, God's people mainly comprised Gentiles who believed in Jesus as well as (μετά) the just descendants of Jacob (here understood as Jews).[56] Yet one senses in Justin that Jews who became Christian were Jews no more.[57]

Although there is a reference in the dialogue to Rebekah (*Dial.* 46.3) it is made only in passing. In the section of the dialogue that is concerned with the call of the Gentiles (*Dial.* 109-111, 115-125, 130) and God's present relationship with the Jews (*Dial.* 112-114, 131-136) is found Justin's mention of Jacob and his brother (*Dial.* 134.5). Mach believes that this ref-

---

[53] S.G. Wilson, "Marcion and the Jews," in S.G. Wilson, *op. cit.* 45-58, highlights the importance of understanding Marcion's attitude towards the Jews in order to understand Justin's position.

[54] Jus. *Dial.* 10.3; 11.3; 12.1 (citing Is. 55:3-5); 13.2 (citing Is. 52:10); 14.4-7 (citing Is. 55:3-5 again); 16.2; 24.3-5 (citing Is. 45:1-3) (O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 328, notes that "House of Jacob" here meant the Jews); 26.2-3 (citing Is. 42:6-7,10); 28.4; 29.1; 34.3-6 (citing Ps. 72, esp. vv.11,17); 34.8; 43.1; 52.4; 64.1; 92.3; 109 (citing Mic. 4:1-5); 115.1 (citing Zech. 2:14-3:2); 119.3 (citing Zech. 2:15 again); 120.3; 121.1 (citing Ps. 72:17 again); 121.4 (citing Is. 49:6); 122.3 (citing Is. 42:6); 122.4-5; 123.1-2; 130.1-2.

[55] *Ibid.* Even the "you" of the *Dial.* is Trypho and all other Hebrews of the circumcision; 14.8 (ὁ λαὸς ὑμῶν); 17.1 (contrast between others nations and yours); 30.1; 38.1 (the Jewish regulation to have nothing to do with the Christians); 44.1-2; 52.2-3; 77.4; 108.1; 110.5.

[56] *Ibid.* 26.1 (though the context makes it clear that Christian Gentiles were definitely in the majority).

[57] *Ibid.* 39.1-2. At 47.1-4 Justin seemed to accept that Gentile Christians who kept the Law would be saved provided they did not force other Christian Gentiles to adopt their practices. S.G. Wilson, "Gentile Judaizers" 609-610, on the basis of Jus. *Dial.* 46-7, distinguishes two particular types of Gentile Christians here: those who adopted Jewish customs while remaining Christian and those who abandoned Christianity to join the synagogue (in addition to those Gentile Christians who were not attracted to Jewish ways at all). In *Dial.* 47.4 Justin also referred to the pressure Christian Jews exerted on Christian Gentiles to observe traditional practices. Anyone who exerted pressure to observe the Law (be they Gentile or Jewish in origin) was not looked upon favourably by Justin. See H. Remus, "Justin Martyr's Argument with Judaism," in S.G. Wilson, *op. cit.* 66-74.

erence belonged to the tradition found in *Barnabas* and Tertullian.[58] Yet there are a number of differences that need to be explored carefully, beginning with the general context. In an earlier passage, Justin saw the prophecy God gave Jacob in Gen. 28:14, about all families of the earth being blessed in Jacob, as being given to him because he was the ancestor of the Christ through whom indeed all the peoples had been called, but not being given to Esau (*Dial.* 120.1).

More immediately one must consider ch. 134 itself. It continues the argument from the previous chapter that the Jews had remained stubborn in their disobedience of God. Even though the Jewish leaders were able to point to Scriptural proof-texts to justify their actions, Justin was determined to demonstrate the inaccuracy of their interpretation. The example concerned was the number of wives a man might have. Jewish leaders looked to the patriarchs as justification for allowing several wives. Justin countered that in Jacob's marriage to the sisters Leah and Rachel (Gen. 29:16-30) the Jews were meant to see the older sister Leah as a representative of Jews and synagogues and Rachel as the Church, and to discern God's message that the Christ was to come to serve and to restore to dignity the children of all the wives (*Dial.* 134.3).[59] It had nothing to do with how many wives one could have.[60] This was the main point of the chapter. Mention of Jacob and his brother was secondary.

There was no reference to the Rebekah prophecy but merely to the animosity that existed between Jacob and Esau (Gen. 27:41). Thus Mach's point needs modification. It was on the basis of that animosity that Justin could draw the parallel: as Jacob was hated by his brother, so too Jesus and the Christians were hated by the Jews, even though they were brothers. This provides a reason for identifying Jesus (more so than the Christians) with Jacob. For Justin, the connection was Jacob = Israel = Jesus (*Dial.* 134.5—Ἰσραὴλ ἐπεκλήθη Ἰακώβ· καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀποδέδεικται, ὁ ὢν καὶ

---

[58] M. Mach, *op. cit.* 41, n. 61, states that Justin presented "Jacob [as] the father of the Church and Esau the father of the Jews."

[59] B.Z. Bokser, "Justin Martyr and the Jews," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 64 (1973) 114, adds that the poor vision of Leah was used as a statement of Jewish blindness. O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 343, notes: "The introduction of the bondmaiden motif is not called for, and it only blurs the logic of the Leah-Rachel typology."

[60] S. Krauss, "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 5 (1893) 129-130, mentioned that this allegation about Jewish multiple marriages was not found in other Christian writers and that Justin's charge was all too accurate. L.W. Barnard, "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr," *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964) 402, takes this as another example of Justin's familiarity with Judaism.

καλούμενος Ἰησοῦς). To introduce an argument based on the prophecy to Rebekah that identified Esau with the Jews, would simply have obscured Justin's point.

Throughout the dialogue Justin sought other grounds as well upon which to identify Jacob with Jesus. The speckled-herd payment to Jacob was a prefiguring of Jesus redeeming the many human races (*Dial.* 134.4-5). Schreckenberg refers to other connections Justin made:

> Jakob ist ein "Typus Christi" (Dial. 140,1 zu Gn 30,1ff.); die wunderbare Wirkung von Holzstäben weist vor auf das Kreuzesholz Christi (Dial. 86,2 zu Gn 30,37-38), ebenso deutet darauf der Stab Jakobs (Dial. 86,2 zu Gn 32,11); das Erlahmen von Jakobs Schenkel ist eine Vorherverkündigung der Kraftverlustes und des Leidens Jesu am Kreuz (Dial. 125,2 zu Gn 32,25), und es ist der präexistente Christus, mit dem Jakob ringt (Dial. 126,3 zu Gn 32,25.31-32).[61]

In quoting Ps. 24, Justin equated Jesus as the king of glory who enters through the opened gates, on the basis of his resurrection and ascension, rather than Solomon.[62] Therefore, for Justin, the reference in Ps. 24:6 to the God of Jacob was equivalent to saying the God of Jesus,[63] establishing his point that the Christ had been called Jacob in the Scriptures.[64] In chapter 75 Justin again equated Jesus with Jacob through a combination of Scriptural texts.[65] Justin reminded his readers later that he had proven already that the Christ was called both Jacob and Israel.[66] Other proof-texts could be employed. Is. 42:1-4 was quoted to prove the connection.[67] Is. 49:6 was understood to mean that the tribes of Jacob were the Christians and that Jacob was the one who was a light for the Gentiles (*Dial.* 121-122). Is. 43:15, with its reference to Israel the king, had to be, for Justin, a reference to Jesus the king, associated with the suffering servant of Is. 42:1-4 again (*Dial.* 135.1). Just as Jacob was given the name Israel because he had overcome the power against him, so Jesus could be called Israel

---

[61] H. Schreckenberg, *op. cit.* 189.

[62] Jus. *Dial.* 36.5. B.Z. Bokser, *op. cit.* 112, knows of no known Jewish interpretation which equated Solomon with the king of glory.

[63] Jus. *Dial.* 36.3-4.

[64] *Ibid.* 36.2. O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 176, locates this chapter as part of Jus.'s discussion on the new law (*Dial.* 11-42) and that here the emphasis was on Christ's universal rule.

[65] Beginning with Ex. 23:20-21 and Num. 13:16 where Joshua/Jesus is the angel of God. Jus. went on to state that Jesus was also called Israel, as was Jacob. This part was repeated at *Dial.* 113.

[66] Jus. *Dial.* 100.1,4; 114.2; 130.3; 140.1.

[67] *Ibid.* 123.8-9.

because he had overcome the power of the devil in the desert.[68] Indeed, it was Jesus himself who had wrestled with Jacob.[69] As part of his proof that God's new, universal covenant had been established in Jesus, Justin wanted to demonstrate that Jesus was the Christ by demonstrating that Scriptural prophecies about the Christ had been fulfilled by Jesus. Some prophecies were not exclusively about the Christ, but Justin wanted to show that they also could only have been fulfilled by Jesus who is God. It is here that the connection between Jesus and Jacob was first made.

Jacob was also a figure for the Christians, and for Justin that was based on several arguments, but it has to be admitted that this interpretation probably derived from a separate tradition (perhaps Justin's own conclusion) from the one which identified Jacob with Jesus. That latter identification is the dominant one in Justin, for, if Rachel is a figure for the Church then Jacob as Jesus fits with that, whereas Jacob as a type for Christians does not. Jacob's name (Israel) was to be given to all who fled to the Father through Jesus (ὅτι πάντες οἱ δι' αὐτοῦ [Jesus] τῷ Πατρὶ προσφεύγοντες), but the Jews were only the children of Jacob through the fleshly seed (ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τὸ σαρκικὸν σπέρμα τοῦ Ἰακὼβ τέκνα ἐστέ) and that alone was no guarantee of their salvation.[70]

Justin's purpose in this work was to demonstrate that the covenant God established with the Jews ended with the coming of Jesus.[71] Not that Justin said that the Jews were thereby automatically now excluded, but that God had established a new covenant in order that all people, not just one, might be party to it (unlike *Barnabas*, Justin did indeed write of a *new* covenant [*Dial.* 11.4—ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη]). This was the true Israel: all those who are led to God by the crucified Christ.[72] Rather than see no value in the covenant God established with Moses or the requirements of that

---

[68] *Ibid.* 125.3-5. Further, just as Jacob was pained in the hip because of that experience, Jesus too suffered. Jacob received from Israel (the Christ) the name Israel! H. Schreckenberg, *op. cit.* 189, links this passage with the earlier on at *Dial.* 86.2.

[69] Jus. *Dial.* 126.3. H. Schreckenberg, *op. cit.* 189, notes that in this episode Justin sees both "eine Vorherverkündigung des Kraftverlustes und des Leidens Jesu am Kreuz" (in what happened to Jacob) and "der präexistente Christus" (in the one who wrestled with Jacob).

[70] Jus. *Dial.* 125.4. B.Z. Bokser, *op. cit.* 115.

[71] Jus. *Dial.* 11.2-4; 82.1. B.Z. Bokser, *op. cit.* 103-106, notes that the Scriptural passages Justin cited (Is. 51:4; Jer. 31:30-32) do not suggest the future abrogation of Judaism.

[72] Jus. *Dial.* 11.5; 122.2; 123.5-7 (citing Jer. 31:27; Is. 19:24-25; Ez. 36:12); 135.3,5; 136.1. O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 329, notes that seeing Christians as the house of Israel was not self-explanatory for Justin. On 326-353 he discusses two approaches to the concept of the new people of God: an association model and a substitution model.

covenant admitting only of a spiritual interpretation as *Barnabas* had, Justin could see some positive points in that covenant. Yet the people of Israel were so inclined to sin that they needed regulation to give them a chance.[73] Those who believe in the Christ had no need of such restraint.[74]

Skarsaune notes that the texts cited in chapters 123 and 135 were the only ones that established that the Christians were Jacob and, moreover, he notes that Origen was the only other early Christian writer to mention them.[75] In ch. 123 he used Jer. 31:27; Is. 19:24-25 and Ez. 36:12 to support his argument. Indeed, at the end of ch. 123, Justin indicated that he did not know the new interpretation of the Rebekah prophecy, for he continued to associate Jacob with the Jews.[76] In ch. 135, not only was Jesus explicitly identified again as Israel and Jacob, but the Christians were identified as the true Israel.[77] Justin could see that the old Israel had been replaced by a new, and Is. 65:9-12 and Is. 2:5-6 were pressed into service. If the Jews were the house of Jacob physically, the Gentile followers of Jesus were the house of Jacob spiritually.[78]

Like *Barnabas*, Justin appealed to Jacob as a figure of some significance for the followers of Jesus. However, he made no use of the prophecy to Rebekah to establish a connection between Jacob and Christians.

The other Christian writer before Tertullian who made reference to Rebekah was Irenaeus of Lyons. Patrological interest in Irenaeus, however, has not been focused on his views about the Jews, largely because his own interest in *adversus Haereses* was the struggle for orthodoxy within Christianity.[79] Irenaeus did make reference to the prophecy to Rebekah (*adv. Haer.* 4.21.2-3), but Williamson goes too far when he puts forward the view that much

---

[73] Jus. *Dial.* 19-22; 44.2; 45. T. Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (Missoula 1975) 51-56, examines the tripartite division of the law found in Jus. *Dial.* 44.2.

[74] Jus. *Dial.* 26; 46-7 (where believing in the Christ and keeping the Law were not incompatible for everyone).

[75] O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 350-352.

[76] Jus. *Dial.* 123.9: "Ὡς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰακὼβ ἐκείνου τοῦ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπικληθέντος, τὸ πᾶν γένος ὑμῶν προσηγόρευτο Ἰακὼβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ . . ." O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 187-188, notes that Justin did not conclude that Christians can be called Israel, but sons of God.

[77] Jus. *Dial.* 135.3: "Ὡς οὖν Ἰσραὴλ τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ Ἰακὼβ οὕτως λέγει, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λατομηθέντες . . ."

[78] *Ibid.* 135.6: "ὡς δύο οἴκους Ἰακώβ· τὸν μὲν ἐξ αἵματος καὶ σαρκός· τὸν δὲ ἐκ πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος γεγεννημένον."

[79] M.A. Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," *The Second Century* 4 (1984) 219-241, for example, has nothing to say about Jews in recent scholarship.

of the fourth book was a discussion of the relationship between Gentiles and Jews and that Irenaeus belonged firmly to the *adversus Iudaeos* genre.[80] The most one could say, more realistically, was that Irenaeus knew and used some of that tradition, not for its own sake, but in order to advance his argument against the Gnostics that there was but one God. Bacq has presented a structural analysis of the fourth book and divides it into three sections: chs. 1-19 about the one God being the author of both Testaments, chs. 20-35 about the one God being revealed by the prophets, and chs. 36-41 about human free response to God's call.[81] Thus the destruction of Jerusalem was not for Irenaeus a sign of the lesser importance of the God of the Jewish Scriptures, as it was for the Gnostics he opposed, but one that the city had served its purpose in bringing forth the Christ (*adv. Haer.* 4.4.1). Irenaeus could thereby maintain a positive but limited role for Judaism: positive, in that it was the seedbed that God used to bring forth the Christ, but limited, in that its role ended with the coming of that Christ (*adv. Haer.* 4.4.2). The primary objective of the chapter, however, remained that of reaffirming that it was the one God who established both the old law and the new. Throughout these chapters Irenaeus sought to identify the God of the old covenant as the God of the new by demonstrating that the new covenant was prophesied in the old and that therefore it was the one God at work (*e.g. adv. Haer.* 4.7.1-3). That addressed the main concern of Irenaeus: the arguments of the Gnostics.

It does have to be admitted that this approach, which salvaged the Jewish Scriptures for Christianity, did not retain the Jews as God's people any longer, as far as Christians were concerned. By neither seeing nor accepting the Christological dimension to the old covenant, the Jews could not really know God because they did not know the Son.[82] Irenaeus was quite specific in identifying the Jews: *Propter hoc Judaei excesserunt a Deo, Verbum eius non recipientes, sed putantes per seipsum Patrem sine Verbo, hoc est sine filio, posse cognoscere Deum.*[83] What Jesus did was to free people from the yoke or bondage of the Mosaic law (*adv. Haer.* 4.13.2) which had first been imposed because the Jews had abused the liberty God had given them through their disobedience and stubbornness (*adv. Haer.* 4.15.1-2).

For Irenaeus, not only did the old law foretell the coming of the Christ,

---

[80] C.L. Williamson, *op. cit.* 283.

[81] P. Bacq, *De l'ancienne nouvelle alliance selon S. Irénée: Unité du livre IV de l'Adversus Hareses* (Paris 1978).

[82] Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22; Jn. 3:35; 13:3.

[83] Iren. *adv. Haer.* 4.7.4. See also 4.26.1.

so too did the prophets. They were witnesses to the working of the Word throughout history and foretellers of his coming as human (*adv. Haer.* 4.20.4-5). The theme of there being one God continued into the second section of the book. It is in this context that the Rebekah prophecy must be understood. The Gentiles who believe in Jesus (*ex gentibus credunt in Christum Iesum*) were prefigured in Abraham, who believed God's promise that the nations would be justified through faith (*adv. Haer.* 4.21.1). The inference Irenaeus intended his readers to draw was that it was the same God who achieved this in Jesus who also had announced it to Abraham. Abraham thus had typological significance. It was because it was the one God that Abraham's faith and Christians' faith were one and the same (*eo quod una et eadem illius, et nostra sit fides . . .*).

Isaac, the father of the twins, also had typological significance (*adv. Haer.* 4.21.2—*non sine significatione*). It is worth drawing attention to the fact that Irenaeus mentioned Isaac, for his focus was on Rebekah and her twins, not Isaac. His purpose (as it had been with mentioning Abraham) was to demonstrate that the God who made the prophecy to Rebekah was the same God who brought this to fulfillment in Christ and (as it had been with mentioning Abraham) that God's plan of salvation was based on free choice (*adv. Haer.* 4.21.2). Here Irenaeus quoted Rom. 9:11 (*ut secundum electionem propositum Dei permaneat, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante . . .*). Irenaeus adopted the Pauline interpretation that this prophecy was about God's freedom to choose, demonstrated by his choosing the younger twin rather than the older.

However, Irenaeus went further than Paul by identifying the two nations born to Rebekah (one in bondage, one in freedom) as the Jews and the Christians. The Christians, who have believed in Jesus, are later in time than the Jews (and Irenaeus' quoting of Jn. 19:15 leaves no room for doubt that they were whom he meant) who did not (*adv. Haer.* 4.21.3—*In Christo autem universa benedictio: et propter hoc benedictiones prioris populi a Patre surripuit posterior populus . . .*). Irenaeus spent no time establishing that the Christians were the younger nation. The Christians were Jacob for, as in the case of Jacob and Esau, they had snatched away the blessings of the former people (the Jews). There were other connections between Christians and Jacob that did not rely directly upon the prophecy to Rebekah: just as Jacob was persecuted by Esau for taking the latter's birthright, so too the Church was persecuted by the Synagogue;[84] just as the tribes of Jacob were born

[84] Iren. *adv. Haer.* 4.21.3: "*Ob quam causam fratris patiebatur insidias et persecutiones frater suus sicut et Ecclesia hoc idem a Judaeis patitur.*"

in a strange country (Gen. 30:25), Jesus was in a strange country when he generated the twelve foundations of the Church; just as Jacob was promised payment with various coloured sheep (Gen. 30:31-43—Irenaeus did not mention the goats), Jesus gathered various people together; and just as Jacob had children by the two sisters and the two slaves (Gen. 29:31-30:24), Jesus gathered people from the two laws and from slave and free (*adv. Haer.* 4.21.3).[85] The chapter finishes with a mention of Rachel as a figure of the Church.

Irenaeus used elements from various traditions but combined them in a manner previously unknown. He had an acknowledged debt to the Pauline understanding of the Rebekah passage as being about God's freedom, combined with part of what is found in *Barnabas* that the younger son no longer represents Israel as traditionally understood.[86] As Irenaeus did not know *Barnabas*,[87] this is a strong argument for the existence of *testimonia* which served as a common source (unless it were a coincidentally independent idea for both). The mention of the twelve tribes, the coloured sheep, and the wives of Jacob (the last two having some parallel in Justin) could also be derived from such Testimonies, but perhaps directly from Justin himself, because the overlapping typologies there (Leah-Rachel/slave wife-free wife; Jacob-Jesus, Rachel-Church/Jacob-Christians, Rachel-Church) are found also in Irenaeus.

V

Now we return to Tertullian. He made no use of the Pauline emphasis on God's free election of the younger twin (whom Paul regarded still as representing Israel). Perhaps he was aware of Paul's association of Jacob with Israel and did not find that helpful for his purposes, or perhaps the whole argument about election was superfluous to his position. Certainly, although Romans was frequently referred to in Tertullian, Rom. 9:10-13 never received mention anywhere in Tertullian's writings.

When it came to identifying the typological significance of Jacob and Esau, Tertullian was more explicit than *Barnabas*. As has been argued here, *Barnabas* nowhere referred to Jews and Christians because such a clear-cut

---

[85] See O. Skarsaune, *op. cit.* 343, for the doubling up and confusing of these images in Jus.

[86] The younger son for *Barn.* being those Jews and others who believed in Jesus, while for Irenaeus he was the Church, clearly distinguished now from the Jews.

[87] R.M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (London 1997) 1.

distinction had not emerged at the time of the composition of the letter. For *Barnabas*, the covenant God established with the people at Sinai had been abandoned by them immediately but it had been revived through Jesus. The people of the covenant were those who followed Jesus, whether they were of Jewish or Gentile origins. The prophecy to Rebekah was proof in *Barnabas* that this substitution would take place. Tertullian, writing a century later, lived at a time when the division between Jews and Christians had been well cemented into place and thus he had no qualms in identifying Esau with the Jews and Jacob with the Christians (*adv. Iud.* 1.5-6). However, Tertullian did not adopt *Barnabas'* view that there was only one covenant, rather he accepted that there were two—old and new (*adv. Iud.* 2.9-10; 6.1-2). He did not make the point, as had *Barnabas*, that the first people had lost the covenant at Sinai; instead, Tertullian made the point that the Jews, throughout their history, whether under Moses or their kings, had been guilty of idolatry (*adv. Iud.* 1.6-7). Further, Tertullian made no use of Gen. 48:18-19, Jacob's blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, anywhere in his writings.

It would seem reasonable to conclude that, if he knew *Barnabas*, Tertullian had no direct dependence upon that work's interpretation of the prophecy to Rebekah.

As has been noted above, one of the major interests of Justin in his dialogue was to establish Jacob as a figure for Jesus. The prophecy to Rebekah was never mentioned by Justin. Therefore it did not form any part of his argument; the animosity between Jacob and Esau, the speckled herd of Jacob, the staff of Jacob, the suffering of Jacob, and the marriage of Jacob with Rachel (the Church) did. Even though Justin went on, in one or two places only, to identify the Christians with Jacob, the prophecy to Rebekah played no part.

Irenaeus, on the other hand, did make use of the Rebekah prophecy. Unlike any other early Christian writer before him, he adopted a Pauline interpretation, arguing that this passage from Genesis displayed God's freedom of election. However, unlike Paul, he presented the younger twin as a type of Christians. Here Irenaeus held a similar position to *Barnabas* (though different in the fact that *Barnabas* did not employ the term "Christians"). In Irenaeus, for the first time, is found the association between Jacob and the Christians because as a people the Christians appeared after the Jews. This was to be the main argument produced by Tertullian to support his own interpretation.

To this extent, Irenaeus and Tertullian were closest in outlook. However,

Tertullian had no use for Irenaeus' Pauline position nor for his other supporting arguments (the persecution of Christians by Jews, the speckled herd, or the children of the different wives). Indeed, the idea that the Christians were more recent than the Jews and that the Jews had been unfaithful to God's covenant throughout history were the only arguments Tertullian needed to establish that the younger twin was really a typological representation of the Christians.

Perhaps the most significant adaptation of the Rebekah prophecy by Tertullian was its structural context in *adversus Iudaeos*. Like his other writings, this too displays the influence of classical rhetoric.[88] After an *exordium* detailing the occasion of the composition of the treatise (*adv. Iud.* 1.1-3a), Tertullian provided a *narratio* that contained the basic outline of the history of God's promise of divine grace (*adv. Iud.* 1.3b-7): God had promised universal salvation through Abraham, God promised to Rebekah that the younger nation would overcome the older, the Jews had forsaken the covenant time and again, and the Gentiles had turned from idolatry to faithfulness. All of this led to the *partitio*, the statement of the question at the heart of the rhetorical exercise and the position Tertullian hoped to persuade his readers to adopt. At *adv. Iud.* 1.2 and 3a, Tertullian stated his position that Gentiles could be admitted to God's law (*posse gentes admitti ad dei legem*). At 1.8 this was refined: Gentiles were not only admitted to God's grace but had replaced the Jews. From this followed the *refutatio* (*adv. Iud.* 2.1b-6.1) proving that the Jewish covenant had gone and a *confirmatio* (*adv. Iud.* 6.2-14.10) proving that the new covenant had come.

The point here is that for Tertullian the Rebekah prophecy was not merely one argument among many. It was at the very heart of the treatise. It was a succinct statement of God's intention to replace the Jews with Christians. All that Tertullian considered about the law, circumcision, the Sabbath, the coming of the Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem was as proof that this prophecy had been fulfilled.

VI

When one examines the use of a particular Hebrew Scriptural text at the hands of early Christian writers, one is left with three options for a conclusion: either there was a direct dependence of one author upon another (although one also has to allow for some injection of editorial originality

[88] R.D. Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (Oxford 1971).

by the later into the inherited material), or there was a common source or sources (again, allowing for individual contribution or modification to that source/s), or there were some very like-minded early Christian writers.

It is well accepted that early Christian writers made use of *testimonia*, and modern scholars have long developed their thoughts about whether there was one or several collections of extracts from the Hebrew Scriptures, and whether they were oral or written.[89] As Williams noted, the fact that several authors referred to the same texts means little; what is important is their interpretation. What we have seen with the Rebekah passage suggests that whatever use the authors considered might have made of *testimonia*, they also had their unique manner of remoulding that inherited material to suit their particular outlooks. Although some trajectory can be traced throughout the century under consideration, each author used the material in remarkably different ways and for remarkably different purposes.

How well known was this *testimonium* about Rebekah in late second-century Carthage? This we do not know. The fact that in *de Pudicitia* Tertullian did not explain what he meant when he referred to Rebekah's twins thus must mean one of at least two possibilities: the reader of that work was presumed to have access to *adversus Iudaeos*, or else this Christian interpretation of Gen. 25:23 was widely and commonly known.

In this paper it has been my intention to demonstrate that careful attention to particular arguments reveals that the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature of early Christianity is not as repetitive as Ruether or Stroumsa suggest.[90] Rather, we have to endorse the sentiment of Simon when he wrote: ". . . the monotonous and stereotyped nature of the anti-Jewish literature ought not to be exaggerated."[91] Although the early Christian writers considered in this paper shared much in common in their interpretations of the Rebekah prophecy, they each handled their material, reworked it and added to it in ways that were unique to each of them.

The Rebekah prophecy continued for Christian writers after Tertullian to be a profitable argument against the Jews. In concluding we may note Tertullian's near contemporary, Hippolytus who, as quoted by Jerome, identified Esau with the first people and the devil, and Jacob with the Church or the Christ, and cited the prophecy to Rebekah (Jer. *Ep.* 36).

---

[89] E.g., A.L. Williams, *op. cit.* 3-13; L.W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* 109-135; M. Simon, *op. cit.* 154-155.

[90] G.G. Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism in Early Christianity?" in O. Limor & G.G. Stroumsa, *op. cit.* 8.

[91] M. Simon, *op. cit.* 140.

We may note also the north African Christian writers Cyprian (*Test.* 19) and Augustine (*adv. Iud.* 7[9]). One could also mention Commodian and Paulinus of Nola among other Patristic writers who made use of the Rebekah prophecy. Some associated this passage of Genesis with other passages and many added their own insights to the developing Christian interpretation. The final point to make is that they were all selective in their references to Rebekah's twins. None of them mentioned the blessing Isaac finally gave Esau, that eventually he would throw off Jacob's yoke from his neck (Gen. 27:40).

I am grateful for the encouragements and suggestions of Assoc. Prof. Pauline Allen of the Australian Catholic University who read drafts of this article.

Department of Theology, Australian Catholic University
P.O. Box 247 Everton Park, Q, 4053, Australia

ATHANASIUS' USE OF PAUL IN HIS DOCTRINE OF SALVATION

BY

JOHN R. MEYER

There is nearly universal agreement among scholars of fourth-century christology that Athanasius ignored the human soul of Jesus Christ, an omission that bodes poorly for a sacrificial understanding of his death. I argue here that Athanasian soteriology is a theology of redemption based on the sacrificial death of Jesus and that it is an outgrowth of Paul's doctrine of reconciliation "in Christ." This Pauline salvation motif enabled Athanasius to reject the moral exemplarist teaching of Arius, a doctrine that attempted to combine the radical monotheism of Judaism with subordination of the Son to the Father as taught by Justin, Clement and Origen.

By promoting the idea that salvation is God's own act of "self-reconciliation"[1] Athanasius followed four central tenets of Pauline soteriology: (1) "God in Christ" died for us; (2) reconciliation is an action of the divine Logos; (3) a Christian dies "with Christ" in baptism; and (4) a Christian lives "in Christ" through the combined effect of grace and ascetical struggle.[2]

---

[1] This is an expression coined by Frances Young in *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom* (Ph.D. thesis at Cambridge University: Cambridge, England, 1967), 281. J.H. Ropes was the first to retrieve the idea that the righteousness of God was an act of God himself in "'Righteousness' and 'the Righteousness of God' in the Old Testament and in St. Paul," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 22 (1903): 221-227. Also see Ernst Käsemann, "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM, 1969), 168-182; Christian Müller, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes und Gottes Volk. Eine Untersuchung zu Röm 9-11.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament 86 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964); Peter Stuhlmacher, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965); Karl Kertelge, *"Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus. Studien zur Struktur und zum Bedeutungsgehalt des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbegriffs. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (Neue Folge) 3*[2] (Münster: Aschendorff, 1967); Hans Heinrich Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1968).

[2] For a discussion of the importance of an ethic of asceticism in the soteriology of

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Athanasius used these salvation motifs to affirm that the Logos is the acting subject of redemption, through the true humanity of Christ, a soteriological program that presumes the presence of a human soul. I will try to prove this thesis in the following way.

First, we will outline Athanasius' famous dictum concerning the purpose of the Incarnation: the Son became a man to die for the sins of all humanity.[3] That the Messiah performs a divine/human sacrifice was certainly new to Christianity, and Athanasius relies heavily on the theological insights of Paul to explain it. Second, although he does not present a detailed description of Christ's anthropological make-up, by depicting Jesus' death as an expiatory sacrifice Athanasius demonstrates belief in the Lord's human soul. Third, by speaking of different aspects of Jesus' activities, some which are divine and others human, he clearly teaches the *communicatio idiomatum* doctrine. Finally, Athanasius' identification of two wills in Jesus further evidences a human soul, even though his dyothelitic depiction of Christ is rather simple.

The Word Became Flesh to Die for our Sins

Although Paul does not discuss the idea of "sacrifice" per se, Jesus' passion and death are primary points of reference for him.[4] Indeed, he regarded Jesus' death and resurrection as the principal cause of salvation. The death of "God in Christ" ushered in a "new creation" of humanity, shattering the "dividing wall" separating Jew and Gentile (cf. Eph. 2:14-15) and nullifying "the curse of the law" (cf. Gal. 3:13a). Jesus' death was a sacrificial act signaling the beginning of partially "realized" eschatology, whose inchoate presence in the world resides in the resurrected body of Christ.[5]

There is great interest in reassessing the significance of Christ's sacrifice.

Athanasius see David Brakke's *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

[3] Athanasius, *De incarnatione Verbi* 9 (PG 25.112 A).

[4] See S.W. Sykes, "Outline of a Theology of Sacrifice," in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 282-298.

[5] Although Paul uses apocalyptic language in referring to this "new life" of communion with God, it would be wrong to term Paul's theology an "apocalyptic eschatology," as Christ's victory over sin and death often remains hidden to our eyes. See Leander E. Keck, "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology," *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 229-241; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1983), 171-180. On Paul's correction of the Corinthian's excessively apocalyptic/realized eschatology see Anthony C. Thiselton,

René Girard claims that New Testament sacrificial rites are a remnant of the Old Testament mythological scapegoat motif, and that in contemporary cultures these rituals enable people to deal with feelings of "victimization."[6] But viewing sacrifice as a universal psychological, social, or epistemological trait is no longer acceptable to many scholars, because the social and religious contexts in which rituals arise offer ample explanations of their meaning(s).[7] First-century Palestinian Judaism considered ritual sacrifice a "gift-offering" to God and not a penal exchange.[8] Jewish rabbis taught that God forgives sins when one repents and fulfills the rites of atonement prescribed by the law. What is unique about sacrifice in early Christianity is its vigorous condemnation of animal sacrifice (e.g., 1 Cor. 8:1-11; Acts 14:8-18)[9] and the belief in a Messiah who bears away the sins of humanity, effectively dispensing with the figurative scapegoat.

Alexandrian speculation at the beginning of the fourth century tried to define the status of the Logos in a way that would explain how he relates to the created world. Where does the Logos dwell? Is he beyond sense experience? Can we come to know him in and through the world? And if we can know God in and through the incarnate Logos, what does that

"Realized Eschatology at Corinth," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 510-526; Peter Stuhlmacher, "Eighteen Theses on Paul's Theology of the Cross," in *Reconciliation Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 155-168.

[6] See R. Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977); idem, *Things Hidden Since the Foundation of the World* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987). Girard acknowledges his anti-religious bias concerning sacrifice, claiming that it is free of all theological significance and that we should replace christology with anthropology and ethics as a "strategy of immunization" against natural violence. For a critical review of Girard see M. Herzog, "Religionstheorie und Theologie René Girards," *Kerygma und Dogma* 38 (1992): 105-137; for favorable opinions see Ingolf U. Dalferth, "Christ Died for Us," in S.W. Sykes (ed.), *Sacrifice and Redemption. Durham Essays in Theology*, 311; R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, René Girard, Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation* (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 1987), 108 & 117; James G. Williams, *The Bible, Violence, and the Sacred* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1992).

[7] Stanley K. Stowers criticizes the conclusions of Emile Durkeim, Henri Hubert, Marcel Mauss, and René Girard for not recognizing that all forms of sacrifice—pagan, Jewish, or Christian—are the product of specific views of society and the world. See his "Greeks Who Sacrifice and Those Who Do Not: Toward an Anthropology of Greek Religion," in L.M. White and O.L. Yarbrough (eds.), *The Social World of the First Christians. Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 293-333.

[8] George B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925), 1-20; Roland de Vaux, *Les institutions de L'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Cerf, 1960) 2.295-299.

[9] See Dennis Trout, "Christianizing the Nolan Countryside: Animal Sacrifice at the Tomb of St. Felix," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 281-298, *281-282.

tell us about his divine status? Is he of the same essence as the Father or is he a creature made by God to create and save the world?

Athanasius' declaration of Christ's consubstantial equality with the Father is dogmatic when compared to Arius' more "reasoned" christology. Indeed, Arius was probably so attractive to so many because he "demythologized" early Christianity's concept of Jesus Christ.[10] But did he err on this score? Athanasius claims he did. In fact, he was convinced that Arianism denied the Lord's divinity and voided Jesus' death of salvific value.

Based on an important theological insight of Paul, Athanasius affirmed that Jesus' sacrifice and the co-crucifixion of all Christians "in Christ" (cf. Gal. 2:19 & Rom. 6:6-8) are connected by the vicarious action of God-incarnate dying "for us" (Rom. 5:8; cf. 1 Cor. 15:3).[11] The crucifixion of Jesus "suffice(d) for death on behalf of all" (ἀντὶ πάντων ἱκανὸν γένηται τῷ θανάτῳ), so that we might become incorruptible "by the grace of the resurrection" (τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριτι).[12] A sacrificial death was needed for this because "the law of death prevailed over us, and it was impossible to flee the law since this had been established by God because of the transgression."[13] This law was a "law of death" for Paul (cf. 2 Cor. 6-7), and Christ's death provided a new kind of law, a call to discipleship.[14] All human beings can receive the glory of the resurrected Christ and be refashioned into a temple of God (cf. 1 Cor. 6:19a; 2 Cor. 5:1-10) by living according to the "law of the spirit" (cf. 2 Cor. 6:9-10).

---

[10] Jean Guitton, *Great Heresies and Church Councils* (New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1965), 90.

[11] Athanasius attempts to bridge the gap between the predominantly transcendent and unidimensional vision of God (= monotheistic) characteristic of Judaism and the Christian profession of the immanent-incarnate presence of the Logos in Jesus. For more on the notion of "co-crucifixion" see Ben F. Meyer's *The Early Christians. Their World Mission and Self-Discovery* (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1986), 114-158; John McIntyre, *The Shape of Soteriology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992), 42-44.

[12] Athanasius, *De incarnatione Verbi* 9 (PG 25.112 A); cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.9; 3.41 (GCS 1.136; 1.237-8); *De Principiis* II.6.3-5 (GCS 5.141-145).

[13] *De incarnatione Verbi* 6 (PG 25.105 D).

[14] On this idea see David E. Holwerda, *Jesus and Israel, One Covenant or Two?* (Grand Rapids/Leichester: Wm. B. Eerdmans/Apollos, 1995), 122-145; James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus' Call to Discipleship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 83-85. Regarding the curse of the law and its importance to Pauline soteriology see R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, "Sacred Violence and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.13): The Death of Christ as a Sacrificial Travesty," *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 100-101; T.L. Donaldson, "The Curse of the Law and the Inclusion of the Gentiles. Galatians 3.13-14," *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 94-112.

The strict nomistic line of Judaism considered sacrifice a legitimate means of atoning for sins, but rabbis focused on the conditions required to obtain God's pardon and not on how ritual atonement "worked."[15] Early Christianity, on the other hand, boldly stated that a repentant believer can be forgiven and reconciled with God by virtue of the death of Jesus Christ. The commemoration and re-enactment of his sacrifice is at center stage in the Christian liturgy. In effect Jesus established a new cultic ritual by combining two Jewish religious traditions, the Day of Atonement (*Yom Kippur*) and the liberation of the chosen people from Egyptian slavery (*Pesach*). The re-enactment of his sacrificial death is God's "sin-offering" for us,[16] and Jesus' representative and vicarious death is God's response to the need for each human being to redress divine justice: "there was need of death, and death on behalf of all so that what was owed by all men might be paid (ἵνα τὸ παρὰ πάντων ὀφειλόμενον γένηται)."[17] Nevertheless, the death of the Son of God is not merely a substitution or vicarious representation; in fact, Paul and Athanasius anticipate the Anselmian and Calvinian theories of penal substitution by expanding the notion of redemption beyond the realm of mere satisfaction to embrace all the major redemption motifs. The most important motif for Athanasius was the propitiatory and expiatory sacrifice of Christ on the cross. The pre-existent Logos became a ransom for all, suffering "for us," and acting as an advocate "on our behalf" before the Father.[18]

---

[15] E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 167.

[16] See R.J. Daly, *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology. The Proclamation of Jesus. vol. I* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 288-292. Although neither Paul nor Athanasius translate the Hebrew word *'asham* ("sin-offering") exactly, they definitely affirm the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death. Paul may have avoided using the phrase "sin-offering" because it was foreign to Gentile converts (see G. Ashby, *Sacrifice. Its Nature and Purpose* [London: SCM, 1988], 58).

[17] *De incarnatione Verbi* 20 (PG 25.132 B).

[18] Athanasius, *De incarnatione Verbi* 7 & 9 (PG 25.109 A & 112 B); cf. *Epistola ad Epictetum* 4 (PG 26.1057 B). For more on this see Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995), 385. Paul Fiddes, in *Past Event and Present Salvation: The Christian Idea of Atonement*, (Louisville: Westminster/J. Knox, 1989), 70 claims that Athanasius advocates a juridical approach to salvation akin to Calvin's theory of penal substitution; Leon Morris, in *The Cross of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1988), 12-13 says the same thing of Athanasius and Ambrose. The debt and ransom motif was embraced by many early Church writers based on a series of Old and New Testament references. The OT underscores the historical liberation of the chosen peo-

As we will have occasion to discuss later, Athanasius uses the substitutionary expression "in the place of" to refer to the debt owed and not to the person paying the debt. The incorruption we receive involves a transformation of our existence by the Son's annihilation of death and the subsequent release of souls from the dominion of Satan (cf. Heb. 2:14-15).[19]

Of equal importance to Athanasius was the idea that a baptized Christian gives witness to the presence of Christ in their soul by the practice of such virtues as chastity, sobriety, civil harmony, fortitude, charity, and most important of all, martyrdom.[20] He learned about this super-human way of life from the Egyptian monk Anthony, who taught him that satanic influences affect a person primarily through disordered desire. Therefore, liberation from the forces of evil involves something more than propitiation, expiation, and satisfaction; the redeemed must act with an upright will and rectitude of intention, fleeing the occasions of sin.[21] It no longer

---

ple from Egyptian bondage (Ex. 6:16; 15:13) and Babylonian captivity (Is. 43:1; 48:20; Jer. 31:11), as well as a moral liberation from trials (cf. Ps. 25:22; 72:14) and sin (cf. Ps. 130:8). The NT affirms that Christ gave his life as a ransom for all (Mk. 10:45; Matt. 20:28), and Paul used this ransom metaphor to signify one aspect of redemption (1 Cor. 1:30; Rom. 3:24; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:4; 1 Tim. 2:6). See Fernand Prat, in *The Theology of Saint Paul* (Westminster, MD.: The Newman Bookshop, 1956) 2.185-188, 195-200. While Athanasius' use of the Pauline *hyper* formulae ("for our sakes," "on our behalf," "in our place" [cf. 1 Cor. 15:3]) points to a delegated action of the Logos, the strong emphasis on the Christian's participation in the life of the resurrected Christ prevents misconstruing this vicarious action. Jesus' death was a ransom paid "in the place of" (*antilytron*) our death, destroying the infirmities of our nature and investing us with his divine incorruptibility (cf. 1 Pet. 1:4). On this see Athanasius' *Epistola ad Epictetum* 6-7 (PG 26.1060 C-1061 A).

[19] See Athanasius, *De incarnatione Verbi*, 15 & 20 (PG 25.124 B & 132 BC).

[20] Ibid., 51 & 52 (PG 25.188-189).

[21] The *Vita Antonii* tract records how the Egyptian monk fought against a variety of temptations that are ultimately rooted in disordered earthly attachments: the attraction of material things, family ties, greed, vainglory, food and drink, relaxation, sensuality, even the effort required to become virtuous. Anthony won his battles because the Word of God was present in him and working with him (cf. VA, 5), enabling him to live according to the spirit and not according to the flesh (VA, 6-7; cf. Rom 8:3-4). H. Weingarten challenged the traditional ascription of the *Vita* to Athanasius on historical grounds, but most of his premises were later refuted. See T.D. Barnes, "Angel of Light or Mystic Initiate? The Problem of the *Life of Antony*," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 37 (1986): 353-367; idem, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1993), 240 note 64; Andrew Louth, "St. Athanasius and the Greek Life of Antony," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 39 (1988): 504-509; David Brakke, "The Greek and Syriac Versions of the Life of Antony," *Le Muséon* 107/1-2 (1994): 29-53.

suffices to observe the literal dictates of the law; a Christian must put their whole heart into serving God and others. While the Mosaic law had been helpful in guiding the proper conduct of Jewish believers up to the coming of Christ, only the presence of the Spirit of God enables a person to overcome the rule of death and attain true righteousness and divinization.[22] For Athanasius, the participatory nature of the process of divinization hinges on the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death, which in turn requires that his human nature be complete in all respects.

Did Athanasius Envision a Human Soul in Jesus Christ?

While most patristic commentators claim Athanasius does not ascribe a human soul to Christ, Christopher Stead suggests that both Athanasius and Arius assumed the presence of a soul and Karl Adam even claims Apollinaris did as well![23] Perhaps the question of Jesus' soul in Athanasius' thought should be re-evaluated. After all, such an oversight is rather remarkable in the fourth century given that Origen and other prominent theologians (Irenaeus and Tertullian among them) affirmed it for soteriological reasons as the patristic adage *quod non est assumptum non est sanatum* indicates.[24] I first

---

[22] See *Contra Arianos* I, 51, 60 & II, 55; cf. *Vita Antonii,* 7. Several Pauline faith formulations affirm the expiatory nature of Christ's death and portray sin as spiritual bondage (e.g., 1 Cor. 11:24; 15:3; Gal. 1:4; Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 8:3), which impairs upright living and makes transgression of the law frequent and recurrent; the law is powerless to undo such insolence (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:19; Gal. 1:4; Rom. 1-3; 4:15; 5:12; 6:23; etc.).

[23] Christopher Stead, "Arius in Modern Research," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 45 (1994): 24-36, *33; idem, "The Scriptures and the Soul of Christ in Athanasius," *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982): 233; Karl Adam, *The Christ of Faith. The Christology of the Church* (New York: New American Library, 1957), 30-33. Also see M. Richard, "S. Athanase et la Psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens," *Mélanges des Sciences Religieuses* 4 (1947): 5-54; D. Ritschl, *Athanasius, Versuch einer Interpretation* (Zurich 1964—*Theologische Studien* 76), 58-60; J. Roldanus, *Le Christ et l'homme dans la théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie. Étude de la conjonction de sa conception de l'homme avec sa christologie* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought IV—Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), 252-276 & 349-364; C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria and the Foundation of Traditional Christology," in *Theological Studies* 34 (1973): 109-110; A.L. Pettersen, "The Questioning of Christ in Athanasius' Contra Arianos III," in R.C. Gregg (ed.), *Arianism: Historical and Theological Re-assessments* (Cambridge, MA.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985): 243-256.

[24] Origen, *Dialogue with Herakleides* (J. Scherer, *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide et les évêques ses collèges sur le père, le fils, et l'âme* [Cairo: Publications de la Société Fonad I de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents IX, 1949]); idem, *De Princ.* II, 8, 4 (PG 11.224 B);

review Origen's position on the soul of Christ and its influence on Arius and then go on to discuss Athanasius' own view.

Origen highlighted the superiority of Christ's sacrificial death over the sacerdotal actions of priests of the Old Testament, a superiority grounded in the solidarity of the Son of God with all human beings.[25] But while Origen did assign Jesus a soul, his explanation of its origin was problematic, primarily because he failed to distinguish between "creation" and "generation."[26] Origen thought all souls were made in the same instant, including the soul of Christ, but that only his soul remained free of original sin. Christ's soul was already united to the divine Logos *ab aeterno*, before the body was created, and the nature of the unity was ontic (not subjective). For the rest of souls, Origen believed original sin placed an ontological divide between the spiritual and the material orders, and that they breach the gap by contemplative association of the mind and soul with the Logos.[27] As the "first-born" of a new humanity (cf. Col. 1:15b), Jesus "deigned to come to death in order to leave an *example* of obedience and [to be] a *model* for those who want to die to sin and vice."[28] This

---

IV, 4, 4 (405 C). Also see Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2, 10; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V, 1, 1; Tertullian, *De Res. Carn.* 2; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Iohannes* (PG 74.89 CD); Gregory Nazianzen, *Ep.* 101 (PG 37.188 B).

[25] Origen, *Comm. in Iohannem* 6.53-58; 28.19.165; *Contra Celsum* 1.31; 7.55.

[26] Basil Studer, *Trinity and Incarnation. The Faith of the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN.: Michael Glazier/The Liturgical Press, 1993), 86.

[27] See Russel P. Moroziuk, "Origen and the Nicene Orthodoxy," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta. Papers of the Fifth International Origen Congress* (Louvain: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 488-493.

[28] Origen, *Comm. in Rom.* 9.39 (PG 14.1239 C—the emphasis here is my own); cf. ibid., 4.7; *Comm. in Matth.* 12.10; *Comm. in Io.* 28.18; *Hom. in Ierem.* 15.6; *Hom. in Lev.* 3.3; 7.2. Since Origen retained the Philonic and Neoplatonic dichotomy between the κόσμος νοητός and the κόσμος αἰσθήτος, he believed that the very concept of God fell beyond the realm of human knowledge. See "Origen on the Soul of Jesus" in Richard Hanson & Henri Crouzel (eds.), *Origeniana Tertia. The Third International Colloquium for Origen Studies* (Rome: Visigalli-Pasetti, 1985), 131-137; H. Crouzel, "Mort et immortalité selon Origène," *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 79 (1978): 23; J.A. Alviar, *Klesis. The Theology of the Christian Vocation According to Origen* (Dublin: Four Courts, 1993), 97-98. Athanasius disagreed with this somewhat Gnostic view of salvation, asserting instead that knowledge of God is also possible through knowledge of creation. This perspective is due in large part to his adoption of Paul's idea of the spiritual illumination of the νοῦς by the divine πνεῦμα and the importance of created reality as an intellectual "way" leading to God (cf. Rom. 1:18-20; Acts 17:22-34). Athanasius insisted that human beings can know God through created things and that the Incarnation restores the image of God in the νοῦς of the soul; in fact, the Spirit of Christ recreates the soul and restores

moral exemplary model of salvation would influence Arius' understanding of redemption much more than his metaphysical interpretation of the unity of Christ via the mediacy of the soul (between the *sarx* and Logos).

Rejection of Origen's theory of pre-existent souls forced Alexandrian theologians to also abandon his idea of spiritual progress. Origen held that souls pass from being an image of Christ to become an eschatological likeness of God, in which the quality of νοῦς is recovered and the soul is reunited to the Logos. In place of this hierarchical Logos cosmology the Alexandrians promoted Paul's kerygmatic "God in Christ," which Arius used to introduce the biblical Father-Son relationship to christology. The problem with this innovative approach was that it considered the Logos more like a distinct divine substance rather than a co-equal, uncreated, divine person along with the Father.[29] This subordinationist and dualistic vision of the Father and Son was present in Origen's thought too. The concept of a Logos-Hegemon together with his doctrine of the soul led Origen to posit a double personality in Jesus.[30]

Since Arius says nothing about Jesus' soul it appears he denied it. But such a denial is not in keeping with the Origenian tradition. Similarly, Athanasius says nothing explicit about Christ's soul until 362, although there is evidence he assumed its presence all along. He insists the Word assumed our flesh in order to save humankind and that we would not be divinized if the Word assumed a flesh unlike ours. A "union was achieved [in Christ] between the true nature of the divinity and human nature (τὸν φύσει ἄνθρωπον) in order that salvation and divinization might be assured."[31] Some years later in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* Athanasius asserts that Jesus did not have an *unsouled* body, [a nature] *without reason* (ὅτι οὐ σῶμα ἄψυχον, οὐδ' ἀναίσθητον, οὐδ' ἀνόητον εἶχεν ὁ σωτήρ).[32]

---

it to its original existence "according to the image of God." See *De incarnatione Verbi* 11 & 14.

[29] Arius may have split the Logos and the Son into two distinct entities. See T.E. Pollard, "The Origins of Arianism," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 9 (1958): 103-111.

[30] See Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*[2] (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975) 1.147-148.

[31] *Contra Arianos* II, 70 (PG 26.296 B); cf. ibid., III, 57 (PG 26.444). Also see Cipriano *Vagaggini, The Flesh: Instrument of Salvation. Caro Salutis est Cardo* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House Press, 1969), 79-82.

[32] *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, 7 (PG 26.804 B). Alois Grillmeier translates this phrase as "lifeless body." Although it is difficult to determine when the early Father's used *psyche* (ψυχή) to designate the soul (and not simply life), I prefer to translate the expression as "unsouled body" rather than "a lifeless body." To say the Logos lived "in a lifeless

While Jesus' soul plays no directive function in his human actions for Athanasius (it was not a "theological factor"), his human nature was not something impersonal: the Son was the acting subject or "person" of Jesus. This very same idea is repeated by the mature Cyril of Alexandria some 40-50 years later and by Leontius of Byzantium in the sixth century; the latter affirmed that Jesus' human nature subsists by virtue of its union to the Logos.[33] Therefore Alois Grillmeier's statement that Athanasius' *Letter to Epictetus* is only concerned with the "object" of redemption and ignores Jesus' body and soul is correct but a bit harsh.[34] "The Saviour truly became man, and from this has followed the salvation of man as a whole," Athanasius writes, "the salvation of the whole man (ὅλου τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), that is, of true soul and body (ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἀληθῶς), has taken place in the Word himself."[35] Why did Athanasius fail to discuss Jesus' soul? I believe he only wanted to defend the divinity of the Logos. Furthermore, given that Athanasius never mentions Apollinaris' error in this letter, he must have

---

body" sounds strange. Stülcken was the first to contend that Athanasius did not assign an important theological role to Christ's soul. See A. Stülcken, *Athanasiana. Literatur- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (TU NF 4,4) [Leipzig, 1899]; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1.308-328.

[33] See the discussion of Christopher Stead in his recent *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 190-191. It was long held that Leontius of Byzantium (+543) was the first to distinguish between an hypostasized and non-hypostasized human nature in Christ. Jesus' human nature is not impersonal (*anhypostasis*) but is hypostasized-in-another (*enhypostasis*; in the divine person of the Logos). This interpretation of Leontius has been convincingly criticized by Aloys Grillmeier, Brian Daley, and F. LeRon Shults. For Leontius, the term *enhypostaton* was simply the opposite of *anhypostaton*, with no metaphysical implications whatsoever. Hence the human nature of Christ is not "hypostasized" or "existent within" the person of the Word, rather it "subsists" because it possesses the property of "personality" and receives "being" from the Word. See A. Grillmeier, "Die anthropologische-christologische Sprache des Leontius von Byzanz und ihre Beziehung zu den Symmikta Zetemata des Neuplatonikers Porphyrius," in H. Eisenberger (ed.), *Hermeneumata: Festschrift für Hadwig Hörner* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1990), 61-72; idem, "The Understanding of the Christological Definitions of Both (Oriental Orthodox and Roman Catholic) Traditions in the Light of the Post-Chalcedonian Theology (Analysis of Terminologies in a Conceptual Framework)," in P. Fries and T. Nersoyan (eds.), *Christ in East and West* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 65-82; Brian E. Daley, "A Richer Union: Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ," in *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993): 239-265; F.L. Shults, "A Dubious Christological Formula: From Leontius of Byzantium to Karl Barth," *Theological Studies* 57 (1996): 431-446.

[34] A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1.324.

[35] Athanasius, *Epistola ad Epictetum* (PG 26.1061 AB).

written it before the Antiochene tome and before the christological significance of Christ's soul was more fully appreciated.[36] This is only logical. Arius denied the divinity of the Word, so Athanasius comes to its defense, emphasizing the soteriological role of the Logos. Only after the appearance of Nestorius did theologians fully appreciate the theological importance of the soul of Christ for soteriology and christology. Finally, Grillmeier contends that when Athanasius says our Saviour "really in truth became man" (ὄντως ἀληθείᾳ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου) he simply stresses the reality of the Incarnation in answer to the Docetist denial of Christ's real body.[37] While this is true in part, Athanasius actually corrects the Arians for saying the Logos descended upon a holy man and that he was not truly made man. They thought Jesus was one "person" and the Logos another, or alternatively, that the Logos was one "person" and the Son another. In either case, the Arians denied a true incarnation of God and so too denied the divinity of the Son and the true humanity of the Word-made-flesh.[38]

Athanasius' approach to Christ's humanity was in keeping with the regnant philosophy of the time in which the soul was considered impassible in and of itself (ἀπαθής) and yet open to bodily passion (παθή).[39] Hence

---

[36] R. Weijenborg, in "Apollinaristic Interpolations in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* of 362," *Studia Patristica* 3 (1961): 327-328 suggests that the drafters of the *Tomus* made use of Athanasius' *Epistola ad Epictetum*, which clearly speaks of an intellectual soul, but that its statements were designed to hide a mitigated form of Apollinarianism. This is an odd theory in holding an earlier document (the *Tomus*) was "doctored" by using a later one; it is more probable that the Letter to Epictetus was written before 362 if it influenced the *Tomus*.

[37] A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1.324-325.

[38] Also see *Ep. ad Epictetum* 2. Again, Athanasius was rejecting Arius' denial of the coequal divinity of the Son and not too concerned about christological mistakes. For further information on this see Marcel Richard, "S. Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens," *Mélanges des Sciences Religieuses* 4 (1947): 5-54 and A.L. Petersen, "The Questioning of Christ in Athanasius' Contra Arianos III," in R.C. Gregg (ed.), *Arianism: Historical and Theological Re-assessments* (Cambridge, MA.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985): 243-256.

[39] Plotinus, *Ennead* 3.6.1 and Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis* 3.22. Athanasius maintains that since the soul of Jesus was created from nothing it could suffer while at the same time being eternal. See J. Breckenridge, "Julian and Athanasius. Two Approaches to Creation and Salvation," *Theology* 76 (1973): 78-79; A. Pettersen, *Athanasius and the Human Body* (Bedminster: Bristol, 1990), 21; M. Richard, "S. Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens," *Mélanges des Sciences Religieuses* 4 (1947): 26-46; J. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne* (Lille: Facultés catholiques, 1951), 149-150; J. Roldanus, *Le Christ et l'homme dans la theologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*, 111-112.

Christ could suffer and yet the Logos remain unchanged[40] because Jesus is not a human being but a divine-human being (something distinct from a divine-human "person."):[41] Ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, οὐκ αὐτὸν ὅλον σάρκα νοοῦμεν τὸν Λόγον, ἀλλὰ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον, καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον.[42] This understanding of the Incarnation is clearly influenced by John 1:14: "For 'the Word,' John says, 'became flesh' (it being the custom of Scripture to call man [ἄνθρωπον] by the name of 'flesh' [σάρκα] . . .)."[43] Besides presuming the presence of a soul, Athanasius defended the presence of two wills in Christ as Maximus the Confessor attests in his rejection of Monothelitism.[44] So, despite Athanasius' general tendency to emphasize Jesus' theandric unity, he did so in a dyothelitic manner.[45] This same approach is followed by Cyril of Alexandria, who, like Athanasius, "tended not to worry about 'how' such a thing [i.e., the Son's condescension] might take place or 'what' exactly the effects of such movement would be on God."[46]

While Athanasius can be faulted for avoiding a direct confrontation with Arius concerning Jesus' soul, insisting the Logos-sarx framework forced Athanasius to dispense with Christ's soul inevitably leads to the surprising conclusion that he denied a true Incarnation![47] The important point for

---

[40] *Scriptum contra Apollinarium* I, 13 (PG 26.1117 A). I understand the immutability of the Logos to be primarily metaphysical. One need not explain divine suffering by relying on the evolutive metaphysics of Hegel and Whitehead to solve the dilemma of God's apparent indifference to human suffering as Joseph Hallman does in *The Descent of God. Divine Suffering in History and Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 125-145.

[41] On this point see the discussion of Gerald O'Collins in *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 244-246.

[42] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* II, 47 (PG 26.248 A).

[43] Ibid., III, 30 (388 C).

[44] For example, *Contra Arianos* III, 57 (PG 26.441 C); cf. Maximus the Confessor, *Opuscula* 15 (PG 91.160).

[45] This is well appreciated in *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* 21 (PG 26.1021 B): "He manifests here [the agony in Gethsemane] two wills (δύο θελήματα): the human will, which belongs to the flesh; and the divine will, which belongs to God." See the commentary of John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987), 146.

[46] John J. O'Keefe, "Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology," *Theological Studies* 58 (1997): 39-60, *48.

[47] See Basil Studer, *Trinity and Incarnation*, 192-193. The same critics of Athanasius' supposed Apollinarian view of Christ also claim Cyril of Alexandria never appreciated the full humanity of Jesus. See A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1.472-478; J. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle nestorienne*, 172.

Athanasius is the concurrent presence of the divine and the human in Jesus, an understanding of the Incarnation which led him to deny the transmigration of the deity (Θεότητος μετάστασιν) at Jesus' death, preferring instead to say that his *soul* "departed" (ψυχῆς ἀποχώρησιν).[48]

To understand Athanasius' project requires appreciating three things. First, he liberally used Paul's unitary vision of the body and soul to replace the Platonic dualism of Origen; second, the acting subject of Jesus Christ is the divine person of the Son, not the human soul of his assumed humanity; and third, a conceptual framework for a theology of sacrifice that explains the role of the soul is notoriously complex.[49] Athanasius' overriding concern was to ensure that the Godhead remained impassible, not to explain the union of the Logos with his soul-body composite. Therefore he categorized the biblical references to the incarnate Son by saying they refer to the Son *qua* human or the Son *qua* divine, even though this leads us to attribute mutually incompatible properties to the Son (such as an unchangeable divine will and an alterable human will). The best we can do is say that Christ acts under the aspect of his divinity in one case and under the aspect of his humanity in another.[50]

As Grillmeier correctly explains, in the anti-Apollinarian controversy we

---

[48] *Scriptum contra Apollinarium* I, 18 & II, 15-17 (PG 26.1125 B & 1157-1161); cf. *De Salutari Adventu Christi* 14 (PG 26.1154). Athanasius' use of ψυχή rather than νοῦς distinguishes him from Origen who considered Christ's soul to be a uniquely pristine νοῦς already in union with the Logos before the Incarnation. This is why Athanasius goes to the trouble of saying that Jesus' soul lived on after death. It was immortal like all souls, not because it had existed from all eternity, but rather because the spirit of Christ dwelled in it (cf. *Contra Arianos* II, 17 [1161 A]).

[49] Thomas Aquinas wrote that a human nature is united to the Son of God hypostatically or personally and not accidentally. Consequently, Christ acquired a new *relation* of his already existing personal existence to human nature, not a new personal existence. Accordingly, his person subsists not only in divine nature but also in human nature. See the *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 17, ad 2. To explain the relationship of the divine and human natures in Christ is no small feat. Even Aquinas' account of the hypostatic union and the instantiation of our nature by the Logos is open to criticism. For example, in *De unione Verbi Incarnati*, Thomas says that the human nature of Christ "exists in another" ("existit in alio id est in hypostasi Verbi Dei"). This led him to suggest the divine person receives a "secondary esse" from his human nature (see *De un. Verb. Incar.* 2 [427b & 432b]). On this see Richard Cross, "Aquinas on Nature, Hypostasis, and the Metaphysics of the Incarnation," *The Thomist* 60 (1996): 171-202.

[50] As Gerald O'Collins explains: "The personal union of divinity and humanity entailed by the incarnation exceeds our conceptuality, and cannot be clarified in plain descriptive language in such a way as to be positively intelligible." G. O'Collins, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus*, 234.

see a general trend emerge which speaks more clearly about the soul of Christ, but "that is not to say that this particular point of Christian doctrine only then gained general acceptance and recognition. Often it may merely have been that the language was clarified and the question brought out into the open."[51] Among those who espoused such a christological psychology in the fourth century was Didymus of Alexandria (= Didymus the Blind). Interestingly, Didymus does not use the soteriological argument in favor of Christ's soul, but rather emphasizes it as a "physical factor" in Jesus' life and the changeable principle of his spiritual suffering.[52] But, as we have argued here, Athanasius already anticipated this clarification.

Christ's Death as Expiatory Sacrifice

Paul's statement that the Son became man so he could create "in himself" one new man (ἵνα κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον), thereby reconciling Jew and Gentile (Eph. 2:15b-16a; cf. Col. 1:18-22), strongly influenced Athanasius' understanding of Christ's death. For a Christian to be reconciled with God and with the rest of humanity in Christ the Son had to become one with us. Here John 1:14 stands out in Athanasius' mind. But, in addition to John's "high" christology, Paul's idea of "new creation" figures prominently too. In fact, Athanasius links this idea with reconciliation to develop a theory of God's divinizing action in the body of Christ: "[Christ] quickened it (i.e., our flesh) in the blood of his own body and opens 'for us a new and living way through the veil, that is, his flesh' (Heb. 10:20)."[53]

Athanasius used the Pauline soteriological leitmotif of "new creation" as the starting point of his reflections on the Son of God, underscoring his protological status as essentially uncreated and identifying him with the Wisdom of Proverbs 8:22-31.[54] This exegetical maneuver is probably based

---

[51] A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1.361.

[52] See A. Gesché, "L'âme humaine de Jésus dans la christologie du IV^{e} siècle," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 54 (1959): 385-425. Cf. Didymus, *In Zachariam*, L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle, Sur Zacharie I-III* (SC, 83-85).

[53] *Contra Arianos* II, 65 (PG 26.285 A).

[54] The Book of Proverbs is a lyric poem composed to Wisdom, recounting her origin in primal times before the creation of the world. Wisdom is a mediating being situated between God and creation and between God and human beings. She is not a distinct hypostasis or an essence detached from God, a notion that Athanasius agrees with and yet does not speculate upon. See Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 144.

on Paul's notion of the pre-existent Son (cf. Phil. 2:6) and John's transformation of Old Testament Wisdom in his gospel prologue. While this idea is evident in early Christianity,[55] Athanasius adds several other messianic psalms and christological creeds to it (Pss. 2; 8; 22; 45; 89; 110; 118) in order to create a new and more profound appreciation of the work of salvation in Christ. In effect he says the Christian is sanctified or divinized by God "from within," that is to say, from within the soul associated with Christ by faith.

Arius had argued that Jesus' "troubled soul" utterance in Gethsemane (cf. Jn. 12:27) showed he was a "mere man" (ἄνθρωπος ψιλός), further corroborating his view that Proverbs 8:22-31 indicates the Logos is alterable and subordinate to the Father. Athanasius rejected this conclusion, saying that sacred Scripture indicates Jesus is "the Word *in* flesh" (Λόγος ἐστὶν ἐν σαρκί) not the Word changed into flesh.[56] Thus Jesus' suffering only affected the Logos *humanly* (ἀνθρωπίνως), by virtue of the human nature he bore, and this human condition mediates our salvation: "It is only because the Logos became man that he was and is the mediator between God and man."[57] Paul's teaching on the mediating role of Jesus as *the* High Priest of God's people certainly influenced this interpretation.[58] Over against Arius' theory that the *pre*-incarnate Logos is the mediator between God and humankind, Athanasius insists that redemptive mediation is only possible *after* the Incarnation. And, as we shall argue later, this mediation takes place by way the νοῦς in Christ's soul.[59]

---

[55] See Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology*, 73-117, 285; idem, *The Son of God. The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 48-51; J. Ashton, "The Transformation of Wisdom," *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 161-186.

[56] Cf. *Epistola ad Epictetum* 5 (PG 26.1057 B).

[57] *Epistola ad Afros*, 23 (PG 26.721 C); cf. *De incarnatione Verbi* 8; *Contra Arianos* I, 41; II, 61 & III, 33, 54, 55.

[58] A good example of this is *Contra Arianos* II, 8-9, where Athanasius quotes Hebrews 2:14-3:2 at length. The stress placed on the humanity of Christ and its connection with Christ's sacrificial death in the Letter to the Hebrews is discussed by John T. Carroll and Joel B. Green in "The Death of Jesus in Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Revelation," in *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity* (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Press, 1995), 137-138. Alvyn Pettersen refutes J.N.D. Kelly's belief that Athanasius advocated an exaggerated concept of consubstantiality and that this led him to believe that all humanity was suffused by his divinity at the Incarnation. See Alvyn Pettersen, *Athanasius and the Human Body*, 35-38; cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*[4] (London/New York: Longman/Green, 1968), 378-379. Also see M. Simonetti, *La Crisi Ariana nel IV Secolo* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975), 46-54 & 268-269.

[59] Here is a good example of Athanasius' balanced theology and intellectual honesty.

As the "acting subject" of Jesus' sacrificial death, the surrender of the incarnate Logos to God's divine plan has two moral valences: obedience to the Father and the gift of self to humanity. These two ideas are enunciated in an Athanasian gloss on Jesus' agonizing dialogue with the Father: "If it be possible, let the cup pass" (cf. Mt. 26:39; Mark 14:36; Lk. 22:42-43). The Logos "was willing but the terror belonged to the flesh,"[60] which not only explains why Jesus said "my *soul* (ψυχή) is sorrowful unto death" (Mt. 26:38) but also hints at the presence of two wills in him. "Jesus manifests two wills, the human will is that of the flesh and the divine will is that of God, the human will asks for the weakness of the flesh to distance suffering; however, the divine will is well disposed."[61] This distinction of divine and human elements also appears in Christ's self-declared ignorance about the day of judgment, where the Marcan phrase "nor the Son [knows]" (Mk. 13:32b) refers specifically to the "true humanity" (ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπινον) the Son possessed by virtue of his [human] body (ἔχει σῶμα).[62]

When Athanasius actually discusses the effect(s) of Christ's death on Christians, he uses Paul's expression "the quickening spirit" (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν; 1 Cor. 15:45) to describe the Word restoring life to the soul. Nevertheless, the locus of this transforming action is the σῶμα (*sōma*) of Christ, not the σάρξ (*sarx*)! For Athanasius and Paul alike the *sōma* was a metonymy for the body and the soul and thus it cannot be restricted to the physical body alone.[63] This same holistic view of the *locus operandi* of the Logos is reflected

---

Other Arians, such as Eusebius of Caesarea, who lent considerable legitimacy to Arius' theory of mediation, allowed Constantinian ideology to control their reading of Scripture and their theologizing. See Alister E. McGrath, "Reclaiming Our Roots and Vision: Scripture and the Stability of the Christian Church," in Carl E. Braaten & Robert W. Jenson (eds.), *Reclaiming the Bible for the Church* (Grand Rapids, MI./Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans Publ., 1995), 63-88, esp. 70-71.

[60] *Contra Arianos* III, 57 (PG 26.441 BC). Raymond E. Brown emphasizes the importance of this verse in support of Jesus' true humanity in *The Death of the Messiah. From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (New York: Doubleday, 1994) 1.170-171.

[61] *De incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos*, 21 (PG 26.1021); cf. Athanasius, *Festal Letter* VI, 7.

[62] *Epistola ad Serapionem* II, 9 (PG 26.621 C-624 A).

[63] See *Contra Arianos* II, 66 (PG 26.288 B) & *Exp. Fidei*, 4 (PG 25.205 C). Athanasius uses σάρξ as a synonym for ἄνθρωπος, the former referring to our weakened human nature (cf. *Contra Arianos* II, 10). On this see A. Pettersen, *Athanasius and the Human Body*, 28-29; F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, 2.402-403; E. Weigl, *Untersuchungen zur Christologie des h. Athanasius in Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte hrsg. von A. Ehrlaad und J.P. Kirsh XII. 4* (Paderborn, 1914), 69; J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter*[2] (Frieburg/Basil/Vienna: Herder, 1961) II/1, 37-43; G.L. Prestige, *Fathers and*

in their discussion of the death of Christ. Paul spoke of the resurrection of the entire "person" of Christ, not just the immortal soul (cf. 1 Cor. 15), and Athanasius insists that Jesus gave up his "entire human existence" at Calvary in an attitude of prayer. By offering up his "body" to the Father, as a prayer of atonement ("addressing the Father"—προσῆγε τῷ Πατρί),[64] Jesus opened the way to heaven so "the salvation of men [might] be perfected in himself" (διὰ σὲ τετελείωται ἐν ἐμοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ σωτηρία).[65] This intra-somatic process is anything but automatic (or just incarnational). Each Christian must imitate the kenotic life of self-sacrifice of Christ by performing acts of self-denial, the requisite actions needed for a baptized person to become a "full-fledged" child of God (cf. 1 Pet. 21-23; Col. 1:5; Gal. 5:25).[66] It is in sacrificial loving and living that one effectively shares in Christ's atoning sacrifice and becomes more fully incorporated into his divine impassibility.[67] And while ascetical struggle is an integral factor in this process, the Eucharist is its ultimate source and the spring of divine energy.[68] Finally, Paul's ransom motif (1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23; 1 Tim. 2:6) helped Athanasius understand that Jesus' death was more than a legal exchange (and certainly not a penal substitution). The ram Abraham finds in the thicket (Gen. 22:15 & Ps. 40:6), which takes the place of his son Isaac, is a sign of his faithful and obedient attitude toward God and not merely a sign of substitution.[69]

Heretics (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1968), 105-106. Although σῶμα in the NT generally means a physical body and not a person, it may represent the entire person by way of synecdoche, a more inclusive term used for a less inclusive one. See Robert H. Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, SNTSMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); idem, "The Essential Physicality of Jesus' Resurrection," in Joel B. Breen & Max Turner (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (Carlisle, U.K./Grand Rapids, MI.: Paternoster/Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1994), 208, n. 12; cf. Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*[3] (London: SCM, 1962); Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

[64] *De incarnatione Verbi* 20 & 25 (PG 25.129 D-132 A & 140 B); cf. *Ad Adelph.* 7; *Vita Ant.* 22; and *Ep. Fest.* 22.

[65] *Contra Arianos* III, 22 (PG 26.368 C-369 A).

[66] See *Festal Letters* II & VII (a. 330 & 335); *Contra Arianos* III, 19.

[67] *De incarnatione Verbi* 54 (PG 25.192 C). See Everett Ferguson's "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and its Environment," in H. Temporini & W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. II.23.2* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1980), 1151-1189, esp. 1162-1165.

[68] Cf. *Festal Letter* IV, 5; XI, 14; XIV, 4.

[69] *Festal Letter* VI, 9. See S. Lyonnet & L. Sabourin, "Pauline Soteriology," in A. Robert

In a summary statement clearly influenced by Romans 8:3-4 Athanasius says: "Not for himself . . . has he come, but for our salvation, and to abolish death, to condemn sin . . . [and] to raise up all from the dead."[70] Here death is not viewed as a quasi-angelic cosmological power[71] but the privation of life itself. The destruction of death is not a defeat of an "hypostasized" evil adversary but an "enveloping" of the moral void caused by sin. God sent his Son "in the likeness of our sinful flesh" to ameliorate the inclination toward evil and "sin in the flesh." This is why Christians can now walk "according to the spirit," being "redressed" in the incorruption and immortality of the Word, an investiture that includes bodily incorruption and freedom from the machinations of the devil.[72]

Jesus Christ is "the Suffering Son of God"

First-century Jewish theology viewed salvation as divine election, with special status accorded the chosen people of God. God provided the Mosaic law or Torah with sacrificial rituals and penitential acts of atonement which, when properly fulfilled, reinstated a member of the community who had transgressed the law. These practices were not thought to cause an internal transformation of the person[73] but served to remind people of their sinfulness and the need for divine forgiveness. God was ready to forgive and reinstate a sinner as a member of the covenant community provided they repented and resolved to observe the Torah, which was aimed at improving moral conduct and counteracting the tendency to reduce justice

---

and A. Feuillet (eds.), *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York/Rome/Paris/Tournai: Desclée, 1965), 820-865, esp. 849-851 & 856-858; idem, "Conception paulinienne de la rédemption," *Lumiere et Vie* 36 (1958): 35-66.

[70] *Contra Arianos* II, 55 (PG 26.264 B); cf. ibid., I, 60 (137 C).

[71] Martinus C. de Boer considers Paul's writing on Jesus' death in this way in *The Defeat of Death. Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, JSNTS 22 (Sheffield, ENG.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988).

[72] *De incarnatione Verbi* 9 & 24 (PG 25.112 & 137); *Contra Arianos* II, 56 (PG 26.265). The expression "redressed" is the counterpart of the "garments of death" or "garments of skin" imagery. See P. Nellas, *Deification in Christ. Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 1987), 47.

[73] This is evident from Moses' establishment of a priesthood "for God" instead of "for humankind." God told Moses to ordain Aaron as a priest "for me" (*l'kahᵉno lî* in Hebrew and ιερατεύειν μοι in Greek [Ex. 28:1, 4; 29:1]), a perspective that is reversed in the NT where God himself establishes his incarnate Son as a priest "for humanity" (Heb. 5:1). See Albert Vanhoye, "La 'Teleôsis' du Christ: Point Capital de la Christologie Sacerdotale D'Hébreux," *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 321-338, *334-335.

to parity in requital (the *ius talionis*).[74] Thanks to interesting recent work in this area it is now clear that Jewish rabbinical teaching did not promote crass self-righteousness. As Paul astutely observed, everyone was under "the curse of the law" (Gal. 3:13a).[75] All human beings were in a state of enmity with God due to the sin of Adam and Eve, Jew and Gentile alike (see Rom. 5:12-21), and all live in the human predicament of impending death (e.g., 1 Cor. 15 & Rom. 1:32; 5:12, 15, 17, 21; 6:16, 21, 23; 7:5).

Paul considered Israel's redemption from this universal plight to be a representative sample of the salvation of the entire human race.[76] Athanasius takes this idea one step further by envisioning the law as identifying actions "contrary to nature" (παρὰ φύσιν)[77] and requiring fulfillment or satisfaction. This important insight deepened Christianity's appreciation of the ontological damage caused by sin. When a person rejects participation in the

---

[74] See E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 161, 168; idem, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 45; B.F. Meyer, *The Early Christians*, 162-163. The Jewish understanding of sacrifice did change in post-exilic Judaism with the appearance of two new types of sacrifice, *hattâ't* and the *âsâm*, the sacrifice for sin and the sacrifice for reconciliation. Michael Winter and P.S. Fiddes claim the Jews were unable to explain how sacrifice removes sin and guilt from the soul. Similarly, John T. Carroll and Joel B. Green point out that the cult of the Temple did not offer forgiveness of sins but reminded Jews of their sinfulness. See M. Winter, *The Atonement* (Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier, 1994), 27; P.S. Fiddes, *Past Event and Present Salvation: The Christian Idea of Atonement* 68-69; J.T. Carroll and J.B. Green, "The Death of Jesus in Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Revelation," in *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity*, 136, n. 7.

[75] Paul realized Judaism promoted a theology of "covenantal nomism" in which the works of the law demonstrate one's membership in the chosen People of God and cultic ritual was unable to acquit them of serious personal sin (e.g., 2 Cor. 15:3-5 & Rom. 3:25-26). Paul's criticism of Judaism was not an attack on their attitude of self-righteousness but their failure to see that the law does not *cause* righteousness. See E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*; idem, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983), 156. Sanders' position has been criticized for denying that legal perfection was expected in early rabbinic soteriology by C.L. Quarles, "The Soteriology of R. Akiba and E.P. Sanders' Paul and Palestinian Judaism," *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 185-195 and I. Howard Marshall, "Salvation, Grace and Works in the Later Pauline Corpus," *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 339-358. Also see R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, "Sacred Violence and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.13): The Death of Christ as a Sacrificial Travesty," *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 98-118.

[76] See T.L. Donaldson, "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3.13-14," *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 94-112.

[77] *De incarnatione Verbi* 5; cf. Rom. 1:26-27. Paul's understanding of the law is complex and his descriptions of it vary according to context. In his letter to the Galatians, for example, he characterizes it as a personal and enslaving power (cf. Gal. 4:1-11) while in Romans he offers a more careful explanation (especially in Romans 7).

life of the Word (τοῦ λογοῦ αὐτοῦ μετασχόντα), they tend to turn toward the non-existence (= death) from whence they came; therefore repentance alone is insufficient satisfaction for reconciliation with God.[78] One must undergo a radical transformation of one's very "being" in order to be reconciled with him.

> If... there had been only sin and not its consequence of corruption, repentance would have been quite good. But, since transgression had overtaken them, men were now prisoners to natural corruption (φθορὰν κατὰ φύσιν), and they were deprived of the grace of being [living] in the image (καὶ τὴν τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα χάριν ἀφαιρεθέντες ἦσαν)... [Hence only] the Word of God [and] the Word of the Father was both able to reconstitute all things (ἀνακτίσαι τὰ ὅλα) and to suffer for all (ὑπὲρ πάντων παθεῖν) and to be an advocate on behalf of all (πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ πάντων) before the Father.[79]

God effects this transformation by virtue of the condescension or συγκατάβασις of his pre-existent Son (cf. Phil. 2:5-11), who humbled himself in taking a human body to himself and in offering it up to an ignominious death. God "highly exalted" Jesus for this act of altruistic love, giving him a name above every other name (cf. Phil. 2:7-9).[80]

The verb συγκαταβάλλω (to condescend) can have a variety of meanings, including "to go," "to come down with," "to go down together," or even "to come down to one's aid."[81] Athanasius saw the condescension of the Word as vitally linked with the transformation of human nature. We find evidence of this in a comment on Jesus' intriguing answer to Nicodemus about the need to be born again (cf. Jn. 3:5): the soul "is born again and restored to an existence according to the very image of God (τὴν ἀναγεννωμένην καὶ ἀνακτιζομένην ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα δηλῶν).[82] By modifying Paul's "new creation" motif (cf. 2 Cor. 5:17) Athanasius correctly interprets the meaning of κτίσις in Proverbs 8:22: "the Lord has created me

---

[78] Cf. *De incarnatione Verbi*, 7.

[79] Ibid., 7 (PG 25.109 A).

[80] See *Contra Arianos* I, 37-40. This exaltation is a controlling factor in both Paul's and Athanasius' vision of salvation (see Nils A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* [Minneapolis, MN.: Augsburg, 1977], 95-120). I am well aware that scriptural scholars are divided over the exact meaning of the language of a pre-existent Christ in Philippians 2:5-11. Some claim it is strictly an "incarnational" referent while others argue it is an "anthropological" comparison between Adam and Jesus. See L.D. Hurst, "Re-enter the Pre-Existent Christ in Philippians 2, 5-11?," *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 449-457.

[81] Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*[7] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 753.

[82] *De incarnatione Verbi* 14 (PG 25.120 D).

(ἔκτισέ με) a beginning of his ways for his works."[83] As the ultimate source of this new creation, Jesus is the "the first-born of [all] creation" (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως; cf. Col. 1:15; 2 Cor. 4:4)[84] and the "pioneer" (ἀρχηγός) of the sanctification of the human race (cf. Heb. 2:10). Here Athanasius uses the word ἀνακτίσαι (with κτίσις as its root) to describe this renewal or recreation, suggesting that the soul is remade by some kind of actual *contact* with the Logos, an unmediated and direct contact with the Word of God. This soteriological perspective leads us directly to the heart of Athanasius' theological anthropology which emphasizes the mind's participation in God through the mediation of Christ's own "mind" or νοῦς.[85] His radical incarnational view of redemption was later picked up by Cyril of Alexandria, who, in defending the idea of the Son as the acting subject in Jesus, also spoke of the suffering of God "in Christ."[86] In short, Jesus was and is the "suffering Son of God," and Christians come to "bear his heavenly image" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:47, 49) thanks to that "divine suffering."

Athanasius' conjunction of expiation, restored moral integrity, and the promise of a future resurrection follows Paul's messianic-eschatological interpretation of the Old Testament psalter.[87] By incorporating the Pauline notion of reconciliation to his own concept of divinization, Athanasius asserts that the Son effects the rapprochement of souls with God in the

---

[83] See Athanasius, *Epistola ad Episcopos Aegypti* 15.

[84] Prior to Arius the expression "first born" meant either the pre-existent Word or the exalted Christ. Arius introduced confusion by equating the terms τόκος (born) and γεννάω (to beget).

[85] Charles Kannengiesser suggests Athanasius believed the renewal of man occurs by a direct contact of the human νοῦς with the divine νοῦς of Christ. This is why he does not speak of the soul made in the image of the divine Word but emphasizes that the "mind" or νοῦς is the superior pole of the soul. This new and original concept of man is an advance upon Origen's soteriological anthropology which attributes being made in God's image to the "soul" and reserves the likeness of man to the final stage of spiritual progress and identification with God where it recovers its original quality of νοῦς. For Athanasius the "mind" is what is κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ, not the "soul" (ψυχή), which further explains his silence concerning it. The divine εἰκών itself, in assuming a human body, takes on all the original functions of the νοῦς of Adam. Thus, in the words of Kannengiesser, salvation takes place "not through purification and spiritualization according to Origen's model, but through their personal encounter with the *eikōn* of God who has become a man." See Charles Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria and the Foundation of Traditional Christology," *Theological Studies* 34 (1973): 103-113.

[86] See John J. O'Keefe, "Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology," *Theological Studies* 58 (1997): 44-52.

[87] See M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology*, 286-291.

risen body of Christ just as Paul says in 2 Corinthians 5:19. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself (κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ), for the propriety of the Father's essence is that Son in whom creation was reconciled with God."[88] Moreover, following the line of reasoning in Hebrews 2:17-18, Athanasius says that Jesus' death was "an expiation for the sins of the people" (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ),[89] that he destroyed death by "yielding his temple to death in place of all,"[90] and that he gave himself up to death "to perfect the work of the Father" (Ἡ δὲ τοῦ Λόγου ἐπιδημία τετέλεικε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Πατρός).[91]

Space does not allow us to analyze these intriguing statements further, but they do point to some important general conclusions. Christ's mediation is not just an apocalyptic event for Athanasius (in either the hidden or portentous sense),[92] nor is it merely representational (much less substitutional). Since the acting subject is the transcendent Word, Jesus' death

---

[88] *Contra Arianos* III, 6 (PG 26.332 C); Hastings Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* (London: Macmillan, 1919), 298. By using the passive imperfect verb form of καταλλάσσω (i.e., καταλλάσσετο) without a definite article, Paul maintained that God is the active subject of the phrase from 2 Corinthians. Hence God is not only the goal of the reconciling action of his Son, but the Son is also its agent or Mishnaic *Shaliach*. On Paul's view of reconciliation as from God and to God see Otried Hofius, "'Gott hat unter uns aufgerichtet das Wort von der Versöhnung' (2 Kor. 5:19)," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 71 (1980): 2-20; *7, n. 19; idem, "Erwägungen zur Gestalt und Herkunft des paulinischen Versöhnunsgedankens," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 77 (1980): 186-199; V.P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 335; Stanley E. Porter, *Καταλλάσσω in Ancient Greek Literature, with Reference to the Pauline Writings*, in Juan Mateos (ed.), *Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria* (Cordoba, Spain: Almendro, 1994), 84.

[89] *Contra Arianos*, II, 8 (PG 26.164 C).

[90] *De incarnatione Verbi* 20 (PG 25.129 D-132 A).

[91] *Contra Arianos* I, 59 (PG 26.136 C). This latter assertion probably refers to the restoration of the created world, but it may also mean that Jesus was fully consecrated as high priest upon his death. The word *teleioun* signifies the priestly consecration of a Levite in the Pentateuch, and the author of Hebrews suggests that Jesus' death was a priestly consecration. Although the Septuagint OT occasionally applies the words *teleioun* and *teleiosis* to priestly consecration, Hebrews shows that *teleiosis* refers to perfecting Christ in his priestly office (cf. Jn. 4:34; 5:36; 17:4, 23; 19:30). See Albert Vanhoye, *Old Testament Priest and the New Priest according to the New Testament*, 83; André Feuillet, *The Priesthood of Christ and his Ministers* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 130-133, 218-220.

[92] Athanasius' interpretation of the apocalyptic events at Calvary refers to the separation of the world from its creator and the perturbation of the created realm: "The earth knowing its Lord who spoke, straightway trembled, and the veil was rent, and the sun was hidden, and the rocks were torn asunder, and the graves, as I have said, did gape, and the dead in them arose." (*Contra Arianos* III, 56 [PG 26.440 C-441 B]).

was an ontological "confrontation" of God with sin and death (= non-existence), a special kind of vicarious sacrifice in which the Father commanded the Son to die *as a man* for us.[93] This is why Athanasius says a Christian no longer performs rites "under the [old] law." He or she offers the true Lamb of God who purifies human beings in his own precious blood.[94] "God in Christ" became completely identified with humankind in death, and his expiatory sacrifice ushered in an age of divinization that involves an encounter of the Logos with each soul.[95] This encounter broke down the barriers separating us from God and re-established the original relationship of the world to its creator.[96] Jesus "received" death "for us" so we could become temples of God, receiving a promise of "the resurrection of life" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:21-22) and being freed of the power of death and the dominion of Satan (cf. Col. 2:15).[97]

---

[93] See *Festal Letter* XIV, 2 & *De incarnatione Verbi* 9 (PG 25.112); cf. *De incarnatione Verbi* 54 (PG 25.192); *Contra Arianos* II, 66 (PG 26.288). Th. Camelot, in "Introduction à Athanase. Contre les païens et sur l'incarnation du Verbe," *SC* 18 (1947): 80, writes: "Ce n'est pas simple substitution d'une victime à une autre, c'est notre mort à nous qui mystérieusement s'accomplit dans le Christ à qui nous sommes unis par l'incarnation, et comme ce corps qui souffre et meurt sur la croix est le corps du Verbe, la mort et la corruption sont détruites par sa mort." Also see Albert Vanhoye, "La 'Teleôsis' du Christ: Point Capital de la Christologie Sacerdotale D'Hébreux," *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 333-334.

[94] Cf. *Festal Letter* 1, 9.

[95] See *De incarnatione Verbi* 7 & 22 (PG 25.109 A & 136 A). Charles Kannengiesser suggests the Logos assumed the function of the dimmed νοῦς as exemplary archetype for every divinized human νοῦς in the order of faith. See C. Kannengiesser, "Le Mystère Paschal selon Athanase d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 63 (1975): 407-442; idem, "Logos et noûs chez Athanase d'Alexandrie," *Studia Patristica* 11 (TU 108, Berlin 1972): 199-202; idem, "Le Mystère Paschal selon Athanase d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 63 (1975): 413.

[96] *Contra Arianos* II, 55 (PG 26.261 C & 264 B); cf. *De incarnatione Verbi* 10 & 24 (PG 25.114 AB & 137 C).

[97] *De incarnatione Verbi*, 22 (PG 25.136 B); cf. ibid., 24 (137 C). The Lord had a unique power over his own life as attested by John in chapter 10 of his gospel, and Athanasius cites these on numerous occasions (*De incarnatione Verbi* 22; *Exp. Fidei* 1; *Contra Arianos* III, 36.54.57 [Jn. 10:18] & *Depositio Arii* 3; *De decretis synodi Nicenae* 16.21.26.31; *De sententia Dionysii* 2.25; *Ep. ad Epis. Aegypti* 13; *Contra Arianos* I, 4.16.34; ibid., II, 33; III, 4; etc. [Jn. 10:30]). For Jewish Christians the notion of Jesus' vicarious sacrifice meant "Christ was given up for us" while for the Gentile converts it meant "Christ died for our sins." Paul opted for the second form (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3), which served as a graphic symbol of the obsolete nature of the Temple; Christ's body was the new Temple. See Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 49-55.

Conclusion

Athanasius elaborated a doctrine of salvation that combines Paul's "New Adam" thematic with reconciliation as a work of God "in Christ." The Saviour extends God's power to the soul in order to transform the Christian into a child of God (cf. Gal. 3:26), a transformation that is internal and wholly dependent on the incarnation of the Word. In this way Athanasius countered Arius' pre-incarnate theory of mediation, emphasizing that Jesus *as man* is the mediator of salvation (cf. 1 Tim. 2:5-6). Therefore Hastings Rashdall's conclusion that Athanasius' thought on the effect of Christ's death "hovers between a vague metaphysic and a purely ethical theory of redemption"[98] is untenable. Athanasius' concept of redemption includes substitutionary mediation, but it assigns much more importance to the representative character of Christ's vicarious atonement. His fine appreciation for the principle of analogy in discussing the attributes of Christ would lead to more a profound explanation of divinization in the scholastic period.[99]

For Athanasius the Christian attains salvation by repeating the death of Christ through the diligent practice of virtue, mortification and continence (cf. Col. 3:5). By "dying to self" one lives in the Spirit (cf. Gal. 5:25).[100] The solidarity of the Son of God with humankind prepared the way for a soteriological scheme quite distinct from scapegoat theories and apocalyptic views of God battling an "hypostasized figure of death."[101] Although

---

[98] Hastings Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, 298-299.

[99] See Kevin F. O'Shea, "Divinization: A Study in Theological Analogy," *The Thomist* 29 (1965): 1-45; A.N. Williams, "Deification in the *Summa Theologiae*: A Structural Interpretation of the *Prima Pars*." *The Thomist* 61 (1997): 219-255.

[100] See *Festal Letter* VII.

[101] Thus, Raymund Schwager's application of René Girard's scapegoat motif is of limited value, and his explanation of reconciliation as moral exemplarism is a "second-order soteriological model" (J. McIntyre, *The Shape of Soteriology*, 49-51). See R. Schwager, *Brauchen wir einen Sündenbock?: Gewalt u. Erlösung in d. bibl. Schriften* (Munich: Kosel, 1978)—*Must There Be Scapegoats?: Violence and Redemption in the Bible* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); *Der wunderbare Tausch: zur Geschichte und Deutung der Erlösungslehre* (Munich: Kosel, 1986). For appraisals of Schwager's project see J.P. Galvin, *The Marvelous Exchange*: Raymund Schwager's interpretation of the history of soteriology," *The Thomist* 53 (1989): 675-691; B. Sesboüé, reviewing *Der wunderbare Tausch*, in *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 77 (1989): 554-555; A. Louth, reviewing *Der wunderbare Tausch*, in *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 40 (1989): 703-705. Sacrifice symbolizes the gift of self motivated by the idea that life belongs to God; we offer back to him that which never really ceased to be his. See R. de Vaux, *Les Sacrifices de L'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964), 87; Louis Bouyer, *The Eternal Son. A Theology of the Word of God and Christology* (Huntington, IN.: Our Sunday

Paul speaks of Jesus' death as sacrifice only rarely (e.g., Rom. 3:24-26), his emphasis on the solidarity of Christ with us and the ever-present need to die with Christ (Gal. 6:14) underscores the importance of vicarious substitution. Jesus' death was atonement and not punishment for Paul, and the same is true for Athanasius.[102] Jesus' death transformed the primitive metaphorical forms of Old Testament sacrifice into *the* perfect sacrifice, "demythologizing" the early Christian accounts of the ransom motif[103] and defeating death in each Christian, one by one, over the course of their entire life. The "participationist" redemptive motif of Paul and Athanasius is not a forensic transaction. Jesus is not placating the wrath of God. The Logos is a true representative on our behalf,[104] vicariously acting to reconcile the world with God by a perpetual living sacrifice,[105] and this vicarious atonement is prefigured in Judaism's theory of mystical and non-juridical redemption.[106]

No doubt our most provocative conclusion is that Athanasius assumed the presence of a human soul in Christ. It is all too easy to criticize Athanasius for not having explained the nature of the union of the soul and body in Christ and the composite union of the two to the divine Word. But explaining these two unions is extremely challenging. Thomas Aquinas upheld the soul-body composite, but by considering the soul its substantial form he is hard pressed to avoid positing two persons in Jesus. Put differently. If Jesus' soul is self-subsistent, as Aquinas argues, how can the self-subsistent Logos assume the very same ontological status as the soul, without negating or replacing it? Remarkably, Aquinas' peculiar embryological theory of the succession of substantial forms does not agree

---

Visitor, 1978), 125-131. This does not mean that religious sacrifice is inherently violent, or that the only contact between God and the world is the cross; Paul saw the law as the way towards divine life and full communion with God. Cf. M. Serentha, *Gesù Cristo ieri, oggi e sempre (saggio di Cristologia)* (Leumann-Torino: Elle Di Ci, 1982), 64.

[102] Richard Swinburne writes that "punishment is something imposed by the wronged party (in this case, God); atonement is offered voluntarily" in *Responsibility and Atonement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 155.

[103] See Eugene Teselle, "The Cross as Ransom," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996): 147-170, *152-154.

[104] Cf. D.G. Dragas, "St. Athanasius on Christ's Sacrifice," in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, 73-100, *93.

[105] Cf. E.L. Kendall, *The Living Sacrifice* (London: SCM, 1960), 91.

[106] Cf. M. Goguel, "Ce que l'Eglise doit à l'apôtre Paul," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* 31 (1951): 157-180.

with his discussion of the Incarnation![107] It is hard to fault Athanasius for avoiding such discussions, especially given the more primitive state of theological art at the time.

Athanasius combated a powerful advocate of kenotic incarnational christology in the person of Arius,[108] and in defending the true divinity of the Word he averted the difficulties of Aristotle's hylomorphic composition of material substances. To his credit, Athanasius recognized that the "personality" of Christ is of primary importance in christology and soteriology, not the "functions" of his human soul (important as those aspects are).

5800 N. Keating Ave., *Chicago*, IL 60646, U.S.A.

[107] Aquinas' thesis of the unity of the human being through the unicity of the soul as substantial form is problematic, especially in light of his embryological theory of the succession of substantial forms. In principle, according to Thomas, a conceptus does not become a real human person until God infuses the rational soul, which is the subsistent substantial form created directly by God. Here the more perfect substantial form of a human being supervenes, and the previous "sensitive soul" is corrupted (*Summa Theologiae* I, q. 118, a. 2 ad 2). But, in Christ, the Word does not destroy the rational soul but raises it to a higher level of existence (*Summa Theologiae* III, q. 2, a. 5 ad 1). On this see Linda Farmer, "Human is Generated by Human and Created by God," *Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 70 (1996): 413-427; Thomas V. Morris, *The Logic of God Incarnate* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1986); idem, "The Metaphysics of God Incarnate," in Ronald J. Feenstra and Cornelius Plantinga, Jr. (eds.), *Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement* (Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 110-127.

[108] Cf. Pietro Parente, *De Verbo Incarnato* (Rome: Marietti, 1939), 102.

SATIRE, FICTION AND REFERENCE TO REALITY IN JEROME'S *EPISTULA* 117

BY

JOSEF LÖSSL

Satire is essentially a non-fictional literary form. Its point of departure is a real setting, which is directly referred to. But the way satirists magnify certain aspects of the reality they refer to distorts their picture.[1] Satires therefore are not realistic in the sense of providing reliable eye witness accounts of given situations. But they usually keep to rules, which provide hermeneutical keys for interpreting them with regard to the reality behind their distortions. How concrete that reality is, whether it just reflects a general or stereotype picture of a society or culture in a given age or whether the satire is directed against concrete historical figures, has to be established individually.

The text discussed in the following has to be treated with such questions in mind. It is extant as a letter, but its addressees are not named and it is doubted whether they were historical figures. At a closer look it turns out to be a satire, but it seems at first sight to lack the concrete context that would give meaning and purpose to a satire. However, if it is a satire, and we may assume it is, it must have that context and we may try to reconstruct it using material provided by this text as well as others in its historical and literary vicinity; and although we may not succeed in finding definite answers to all the questions raised by this text, we hope nevertheless to shed some new light on this gripping little piece of ancient Christian literature.

[1] Juvenal (1.86), for example, claims to have filled his tablets with a *farrago* (mixed mash) of urban vice. His guiding interest was in the unsavoury and morally appalling side of the life styles of his age. On satire in antiquity in general cf. E.J. Gowers, art. satire, in: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth, Oxford ³1996, 1358-1359 (literature!).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Two Earlier Attempts at Interpretation

The fictional character of Jerome's *epist.* 117[2] has long been recognised,[3] to the unfortunate effect that the letter has since been considered of little value for historical research.[4] When it was taken into consideration at all, scholars apparently found it difficult to relate in it fictionality and historicity.[5] Thus, for example, Barbara Feichtinger in her recent study first rightly asserts that the letter is fictional but that it may nevertheless provide some information on the historical "reality of women's lives."[6] But then she goes on to say that, since its addressees remain anonymous, nothing at all can be said about its historical context. *Epist.* 117, she writes, is "only a fictional treatise,"[7] "not a letter addressed to historical personalities."[8] What does Feichtinger mean by "historical personalities?"—"Members of the upper class,"[9] high aristocracy,[10] if possible even with names officially recorded.[11] Feichtinger thus uses the term to relate fictionality and historicity in *epist.* 117: As famous names do not occur in that letter and as it even contains phrases indicating that Jerome refers to a "lower" rather than an "upper class" context,[12] Feichtinger concludes that there is no "reference to historical personalities" in *epist.* 117.

But is it enough to argue on those grounds for or against the historical

---

[2] Edited in: CSEL 55, 423-434. The letter is addressed to two women, mother and daughter, living as ascetics, *uidua* and *uirgo*, somewhere in Gaul. Jerome attacks in a satirical and sarcastic fashion their practice of each of them staying as *subintroducta* with a male counterpart. On the practice of *subintroductae* cf. in the following section.

[3] Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome*, London 1975, p. 276 and already D. de Bruyne, Lettres fictives de s. Jérôme, in: *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 28 (1929) 232-234.

[4] Thus, S. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis. Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (= *Historia. Ergänzungsband* 72), Stuttgart 1992, lists it in some reference and in the index of his impressive work, but does not consider any possible links between the two fictitious addressees of *epist.* 117 and prosopographically safer characters in the contextual vicinity.

[5] This is illustrated, for example, by the account of B. Feichtinger, *Apostolae apostolorum. Frauenaskese als Befreiung und Zwang bei Hieronymus* (= *Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 94), Frankfurt am Main e.a. 1995, as discussed in the following.

[6] Feichtinger (1995) p. 209: "Realitätsreferenz auf weibliche Lebenswirklichkeit."

[7] *Ibid.*: "Nur eine fiktive Abhandlung," indeed a somewhat hazy term.

[8] *Ibid.*: "Nicht ein Schreiben an historische Persönlichkeiten."

[9] *Ibid.*: "Frauen, die der Oberschicht angehören."

[10] For an explanation of this term cf. below note 43.

[11] On the chances of identifying Jerome's female correspondents by using official records cf. Rebenich (1992).

[12] On the details cf. below on the *exordium* and *passim*.

referentiality of *epist.* 117? Could not (1) Jerome have written fiction to an historically real person as well—like Eustochium, addressed in *epist.* 22, a text similar to *epist.* 117 in style and content? Or (2) why should Jerome's descriptions of "lower class" settings be taken as "less real" than those of "upper class" ones? Because they are less frequent elsewhere in his work? Finally (3) suppose there were historically real addressees of *epist.* 117, suppose, just tentatively, they were identical with Paula and Eustochium, could it not be possible that they were deliberately depicted as two lower class women at a distant place like Gaul? Could it not be possible that Jerome used in this case a particular literary device, social downgrading, in the context of his use of satire in *epist.* 117? If that were the case, it would indeed be worth while once more to take a closer look at the text and inquire about its nature and purpose.

The classical study on satire in Jerome is D.S. Wiesen's book on Jerome as a satirist.[13] Although Wiesen deals to some extent with *epist.* 117, he, too, like Feichtinger, seems to have had problems relating historical reality and fiction in it. Thus he calls *epist.* 117 "*basically* fictitious."[14] "The recipient of this letter was *almost certainly* fictional."[15] Jerome's letter is "*almost surely* a rhetorical fiction not based on an actual situation."[16]

Wiesen interprets Jerome's own testimony regarding *epist.* 117 in *Adu. Vigilant.* 3 (*rhetorica declamatio[ne] . . . sicut illa[m] quam scripsi ad Gallias, matris et filiae inter se discordantium*) such as to refer only to the actual writing, not to its function as a letter or other kind of text referring to a real life setting.[17] Otherwise, he argues, Jerome would have been less "ambiguous" about it, as the passage could mean both, (1) "I wrote a letter in the style of a rhetorical declamation addressed to a mother and daughter in Gaul, who had fallen out," and (2) "I wrote an exercise in rhetorical declamation entitled 'To a mother and daughter in Gaul who have fallen out'." The text itself, too, does not allow for any conclusion as to whether it was actually a letter or just an essay or a short story for a public of potential readers interested in its language, style or ascetic teaching.[18] The passage in

[13] D.S. Wiesen, *Jerome as a Satirist. A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters*, Ithaca/NY 1964; on *epist.* 117 cf. *passim* in the following.

[14] Wiesen (1964) 85.

[15] Wiesen (1964) 144.

[16] Wiesen (1964) 256.

[17] Wiesen (1964) 84f.

[18] Paula's Bethlehem foundations with their alleged literary culture might have constituted that public. On that possibility cf. Kelly (1975) 276.

the letter itself saying "I was writing the letter, *as if* I was exercising some rhetorical school matter" (*quasi ad scholasticam materiam me exercens*) is as ambiguous as the testimony in *Aduersus Vigilantium*.[19] Neither does the absence of inconsistencies in the narrative point to any direction. Jerome was simply able to write fiction, not just "almost," as Wiesen says, but entirely. It is with that in mind that one should look into the historical setting of those stories. It is simply not sufficient to discard them as products of "mere phantasy" that would not yield any historical reference.[20]

Paradoxically, Wiesen's failure to acknowledge fully the significance of *epist.* 117 as an historical document results from his difficulty to state clearly its fictional character. This becomes particularly obvious in his comparison of *epist.* 117 with *epist.* 22. For Wiesen, *epist.* 22 is a better historical document than *epist.* 117, because it was written to a concrete historical person, while *epist.* 117 is a product of mere phantasy.[21] But is not the outline of *epist.* 22 much more confused than that of *epist.* 117? Jerome himself admits precisely that in *epist.* 117, when he alludes to the scandal he had caused in Rome in 384 by publishing *epist.* 22 and with (by doing so) getting involved in intrigues.[22] Interesting enough, at a closer look, *epist.* 117 appears very much like a purified version of *epist.* 22: While still dwelling on the same topic with the same strong bias,[23] it is more concise, flowerless,[24] as Jerome calls it, meaning void of superfluous biblical quotations.[25] Its polemics are not directed against any one clearly identifiable

---

[19] Cf. *Epist.* 117.12.1 (CSEL 55, 434).

[20] The close interrelationship between real history and history of literature must be considered here. In the years after Wiesen's study enormous progress was made in this direction with regard to other writings of Jerome's; cf. M. Fuhrmann, Die Mönchsgeschichten des Hieronymus. Formexperimente in erzählender Literatur, in: A. Cameron & M. Fuhrmann, ed., *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en occident* (= *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 23), Geneva 1976, 41-99; I. Opelt, Hieronymus' Leistung als Literarhistoriker in der Schrift *De uiris illustribus*, in: *Orpheus. N.S.* 1 (1980) 52-75.

[21] Cf. Wiesen (1964) 86 on *epist.* 117: "Jerome here gives free rein to his lively imagination."

[22] Cf. *epist.* 117.1.4 (CSEL 55, 424): . . . *nec priuata correptio generalem doctrinam facit, cum aut rarus aut nullus sit, qui sub huius culpae reatum cadat.* Jerome had accused high Roman clergy of decadent behaviour and thus made himself enemies. In 385 he had to leave the city and move to Jerusalem.

[23] I.e., among others, the practice of the *subintroductae*, described below.

[24] Cf. below at the end of the next section.

[25] In the light of what is said below, in the section on A Theory of Satire in the *prooemium*, about Horace's comments on Lucilius, there may even be a literary dimension to this. In *Sat.* 1.4, 1.10 and 2.1 Horace criticises Lucilius as being verbose and his

person. It thus tries to avoid further scandal and to that end even introduce the reader to the meaning of satire by reflecting briefly on its methodology.[26] It is this complex of motives involving the use of fiction and satire which has never been dealt with in detail. It might provide a clue for interpreting *epist.* 117 in its own right and its relation to the historical reality beneath it.

Epist. *117 and the* subintroductae

Like *epist.* 22, *epist.* 117 is a polemical satire against the ancient Christian ascetic practice of *syneisaktoi* or *subintroductae*,[27] the cohabitation of men and women living in exclusive intimate relationships without engaging in sexual intercourse. It can be seen in the context of an almost equally high regard of married and celibate life among ancient Christians. The biblical passage used most as the basic proof text for the practice is 1 Co 7:38: "Whoever marries his virgin, is doing the right thing, but whoever does not marry her, is doing even better." In contemporary New Testament exegesis and in the Orthodox (including the patristic) tradition that verse is usually understood as "not marrying" implying the subsequent separation of the couple.[28] In pre-Nicene times, however, there was also a tendency to understand "not marrying" as the staying together of a couple united in the spirit without engaging in sexual intercourse. Although there is only a limited number of witnesses and although it cannot exactly be established what they refer to in every single case, the evidence can neither be altogether ignored.[29] However, from the 4th century onwards, the practice began to be outlawed by councils and bishops and polemically

---

satires often being too loosely structured, very much in difference to the gems he, Horace, produced. Jerome might have seen the relationship between *epist.* 117 and *epist.* 22 in a similar light.

[26] Cf. below in the section discussing Jerome's Theory of Satire in the *prooemium.*

[27] The classical study on the subject is H. Achelis, *Virgines subintroductae. Ein Beitrag zum VII. Kapitel des I. Korintherbriefes*, Leipzig 1902; cf. from the same author art. agapetae, in: *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings, New York 1926, vol. 1, 177. On recent research cf. W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 1 Kor 6,12-11,16* (= *Evangelisch Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* 7/2), Neukirchen u.a. 1995, 208.

[28] Cf. for example, on John Chrysostom, E.A. Clark, John Chrysostom and the *subintroductae*, in: *Church History* 46 (1977) 171-185, 175.

[29] According to Past. Herm. *Simil.* 10.3 the ability of a man to stay with virgins without causing scandal is a sign for his purity of heart (cf. GCS 48, *Die Apostolischen Väter* I, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 108f.; N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas* [= *Kommentar zu den Apostolischen*

attacked, as by Jerome and John Chrysostom (on whose texts Jerome seems to rely),[30] although it lived on, at least marginally and in varying forms, beyond the 7th century.[31]

The spread of the practice in the first few centuries of the Christian era and its decline in later periods might also be explained by anthropological changes regarding the concept of womanhood.[32] Earlier (pagan) anthropological models were based on the concept of a male mind-soul as the perfect state of humanity. According to them every human being aspired to become such a mind-soul, men by excelling in the virtues nature had assigned to them anyway, like courage, magnanimity etc., women, who were conceived as naturally weak and indulgent, by overcoming their natural weakness and become like men. The safest way for them to achieve

---

Vätern 7], Göttingen 1991, 406-410); Tert. *Exhort. cast.* 12.2; *Monogamia* 16 (CChr.SL 2, 1032. 1251f.) advises to take a spiritual spouse (*uxor spiritalis*) after the "real one" has deceased. (Tertullian rejected remarriage under any circumstances. Cf. Achelis [1926]); Iren. *Adu. haer.* 1.6.3 contests the claims of Gnostics to be able to live in purity as *subintroductae*. He produces evidence that some of their sisters have become pregnant (cf. *Sources Chrétiennes* 264, *Irenée de Lyon, Contre les Herésies, livre I*, ed. A. Rousseau & L. Doutreleau, Paris 1979, 95-97; *Fontes Christiani* 8/1, ed. and transl. N. Brox, Freiburg im Breisgau e. a. 1993, 166f.); Cypr. *epist.* 4 (CChr.SL 3B, 17f.) turns down a request wondering whether a *diaconus* should be allowed to sleep with a *uirgo in uno lecto*; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 7.30.12f. (cf. GCS 9/2, *Eusebius* 2/2, 1/3, 710f.) reports that Paul of Samosata was criticised at the Synod of Antiochia (324/5 A.D.) for allegedly staying with *subintroductae*. On further evidence cf. Clark (1977) 171-175.

[30] The synods of Elvira A.D. 305/6 (*can.* 27) and Ancyra A.D. 314 (*can.* 19) and the Council of Nicaea A.D. 325 (*can.* 3) banned the cohabitation of clerics with women not their blood relations (cf. *Mansi* vol. 2, 10. 534. 686. 702. 710). Cf. also the polemics of Ioh. Chrys. *Adu. eos qui apud se habent subintroductas uirgines; Quod regulares feminae uiris cohabitare non debeant* (PG 47, 514-532; ed. J. Dumortier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Les cohabitations suspectes*, Paris 1955); Hier. *epist.* 22.14 (CSEL 54, 161f.); *epist.* 117 (CSEL 55, 422-434); Greg. Nyss. *Virg.* 23 (ed. W. Jaeger & J.P. Cavarnos, Leiden 1952, 333f.); Basil. *epist.* 55 (ed. Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile, Lettres* 1, *Edition Guillaume Budé*, Paris 1957, 141f.); cf. Clark (1977); E.A. Clark, *Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends. Essays and Translations*, New York—Toronto 1979.

[31] Achelis (1926) mentions one case for the Irish church in A.D. 543 and several cases for the Syrian church at yet a later period. Cf. also A.W. Haddan, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents* II.2, Oxford 1869, 292; R. Reynolds, Virgines Subintroductae in Celtic Christianity, in: *Harvard Theological Review* 61 (1968) 547-566; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* 1, Louvain 1958, 78-83.

[32] Cf. in general M.T. Malone, *Christian Attitudes Towards Women in the Fourth Century. Background and New Directions*, Toronto 1971; G. Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity. Pagan and Christian Life Styles*, Oxford 1993; and, more recently, G. Cloke, *"This Female Man of God." Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, A.D. 350-450*, London 1995.

that goal was to live in a state of sexual abstinence, as virgins or widows.[33] The popularity of the practice led to a phenomenon called family asceticism. For economic and social reasons many people were confined to family life, so they tried to live their ascetic lives in their respective family contexts, even when they were already married or about to get married.[34] Only later, when, as, for example, in Augustine, a more positive attitude towards sexual activity in marriage took over, while there was at the same time a surge in the foundation of monasteries, the separation of married and ascetic life became more and more definitive.[35]

Against this background *epist.* 117 addresses a "mother and her daughter somewhere in Gaul."[36] The two have formerly lived in a kind of family asceticism, which may have also included their brother.[37] The mother therefore was a *uidua*, the daughter a *uirgo*, while the latter's brother or cousin is called *monachus* or *nonnus*. He is actually the one who, according to the letter, travelled from Gaul to visit the Holy Land and by the way also the holy man, the author of the letter as depicted by Jerome in an introductory dialogue with the petitioner, to tell him about his grief and ask for an exhortatory letter to the two women at home. They had both taken to mischief and moved in with clerics, each of them in a house or flat of her

---

[33] On ample evidence cf. K. Thraede, Ärger mit der Freiheit. Die Bedeutung von Frauen in Theorie und Praxis der alten Kirche, in: G. Scharffenorth & K. Thraede, ed., *Freunde in Christus werden . . . Die Beziehung von Mann und Frau als Frage an Theologie und Kirche* (= *Kennzeichen* 1), Gelnhausen 1977, 31-182, esp. 129-133; M.M. Meyer, Making Mary Male. The Categories "Male" and "Female" in the Gospel of Thomas, in: *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985) 554-570; K. Aspegren, *The Male Woman. A Feminine Ideal in the Early Church*, Uppsala 1990.

[34] Thraede (1990) 133.

[35] On the paradoxes of intentions and their effects (how "conservative" intentions can cause "progressive" effects and vice versa) cf. J. Simpson, Women and Asceticism in the Fourth Century. A Question of Interpretation, in: *Journal of Religious History* 15 (1988) 38-60: Despite its implications regarding sexual abstinence and its apparent devaluation of female sexuality, the "conservative" promotion of asceticism, as propagated by Jerome, had also liberating effects on women. In contrast, the later "modern" or "progressive" promotion of sexual activity in married life, as propagated, for example, by Augustine, which led to a revaluation of female sexuality, had not only positive but also negative effects, as women were urged to enter married life, take over the role model of mothers in the families and stay away from public life.

[36] *Epist.* 117 (CSEL 55, 422): *Ad matrem et filiam in Gallia commorantes.*

[37] This is suggested by the advice given (by Jerome, resp. his narrator) in *epist.* 117.9.1; 11.2 (CSEL 55, 431. 433), the two women and their brother (resp. son) should reconcile and move in again together.

own, the mother with the soul of her own old age, the daughter with a fop several years younger than her still spotting a fluff. Against this situation Jerome then lets his author direct his polemical satire. His criticism concentrates on the daughter (cc. 2-10).[38] Only c. 11 addresses the mother.

The question concerning the historical background of the letter has already been touched. The ambiguous sequence of *Adu. Vigilant.* 3 and the likelihood of a dependence on *epist.* 22[39] allow to date the letter after 384 or, respectively, 385 (Jerome's arrival in Bethlehem), and before 406. The fictional character of the letter is underlined through the narrative frame of *prooemium* and *postscriptum*. Jerome lets the author of the letter not immediately address the two women, but begins by telling how he came to write the letter, how that monk from Gaul came to visit him, what he told him, what he responded to him etc.[40] He finishes by making some remarks concerning form and content of his writing and the circumstances of mailing it. He says he wrote the letter at night to have it ready when the monk's ship left for Gaul early next morning.[41] He had written the letter "like" a

---

[38] Here the text of *epist.* 117 in many ways parallels that of *epist.* 22, almost as if it was addressed to a Eustochium turned naughty.

[39] Cf. for example the similar use of Cic. *Epist. ad Att.* 12.28.2 (*sufficit mihi conscientia mea*) in *epist.* 22.13.3 (CSEL 54, 160) and *epist.* 117.4.4 (CSEL 55, 427).

[40] *Epist.* 117.1f. (CSEL 55, 422-424): *Rettulit mihi quidam frater e Gallia se habere sororem uirginem matremque uiduam quae in eadem urbe diuisis habitarent cellulis et uel ob hospitii solitudinem uel custodiendas facultatulas praesules sibi quosdam clericos adsumpsissent.*

[41] *Epist.* 117.12.1 (CSEL 55, 434): *Haec ad breuem lucubratiunculam celeri sermone dictaui uolens desiderio postulantis satisfacere et quasi ad scholasticam materiam me exercens—eadem enim die mane pulsabat ostium, qui profecturus erat—simulque, ut ostenderem obtrectatoribus meis, quod et ego possim, quicquid uenerit in buccam, dicere.* Against Wiesen (1964, 257, n. 25) it may be held here that this passage alone does not render enough evidence to prove that the situation of *epist.* 117 is entirely fictional, not even in combination with *epist.* 117.1.5 (CSEL 55, 424), where Jerome says to his petitioner: *Ego uerba perdiderim, tu itineris longitudinem,* apparently suggesting that his petitioner did all the journey from Gaul to the Holy Land only to see him, Jerome, in the matter concerning his, the petitioner's, mother and sister. At first glance *epist.* 117.1.4 (CSEL 55, 424) seems to suggest the same: *Quaeso ergo te, ne me tanto itinere uexatum frustra uenisse patiaris.* But that passage also contains a phrase which suggests that the man from Gaul had in the first place come to visit Palestine in order to see the Holy Places and only then, *post uisionem sanctorum locorum,* to ask Jerome to write the letter, in the last minute. Jerome had hardly time to finish it before the ship's departure. Thus, while it may be held that *epist.* 117 is fictional (with its fictionality being a tool of satirical representation of reality, as suggested in the introduction to this article), the search for inconsistencies in the plot does not seem to be an appropriate way for establishing criteria with which to distinguish fiction from reality in the text and context of *epist.* 117.

rhetorical exercise (*quasi ad scholasticam materiam me exercens . . . quicquid uenerit in buccam, dicere*) and that had been the reason, apart from being in a hurry, why he had not adorned it (like *epist.* 22) with an abundance of biblical quotations (*nec orationem meam . . . floribus texui*).[42] Within this literary framework Jerome develops his plot.

The exordium *in the Light of Satire*

The permeating feature of *epist.* 117 is satire. Already the *exordium*,[43] the very first sentence functioning as a headline, has to be interpreted in the light of satire, even though or, in the context of classical rhetoric, precisely because it can only be understood after reading the text as a whole and in its context, *epist.* 22 and other letters of Jerome's to women on similar topics. If the letter is read that way, the satirical device used in it may be identified as the social downgrading of the addressees to the effect of concealing and at the same time revealing something about the real life situation behind the text.

Thus, when the author writes about little one room houses (*cellulae*), in which the supposed addressees just manage to keep alive, or about their humble fortunes (*facultatulae*), which they share with their clerical friends, he refers to stately homes and considerable fortunes. This will become increasingly clear as the narrative proceeds. For example, in c. 8 the younger addressee is warned that her domestic staff could be a major potential source of gossip about her unconventional life style, which might ruin her *fama* or have ruined it already. Such a number of servants could have hardly been employed in small cottages.[44]

On the assumption, therefore, that the wider context of the letter can be taken into account and granted that this was also the author's intention and the way in which the original readers perceived the text, it should be obvious that by using the satirical means of social downgrading already in

---

[42] The significance of this remark in regard to *epist.* 22 has already been pointed out (cf. above, notes 24 and 25).

[43] On the text cf. above, note 40.

[44] Cf. *epist.* 117.8 (CSEL 55, 431,12): *Ancillae et seruuli.* The women could therefore belong, if not to the very upper crust of society, at least to one of the higher classes, like the *subintroductae* of whom Jerome writes in *epist.* 22.13 (CSEL 54, 161,10) that they wear the narrow purple seam of the higher (sub-senatorial) nobility. Thus the real life setting and the circle of potential addressees of *epist.* 117 may well be identical with that of *epist.* 22.

the *exordium* it was intended by the author of *epist.* 117 to evoke in the reader the impression that there is something highly ambivalent about the situation described in the course of this letter. And again, the way in which that ambivalence was expressed was satire in various forms.

A Theory of Satire in the prooemium *(c. 1)*

Furthermore, satire is not only used in *epist.* 117, it is also reflected upon, especially in the *prooemium.* There the author of the letter discusses with his petitioner his motives for writing the letter. In fact, according to the *prooemium,* he at first refuses to write it. In *epist.* 117 itself the reason for that is only alluded to, but from the context it is clear that the author's refusal has something to do with Jerome's experience in Rome in 384: "I am only a monk," the author sets out, evasively, "locked up in my cell far away from the crowds (*clausus cellula ac procul a turbis remotus*), not a bishop, whose job it would be to reconcile families."—"You are too timid," his petitioner replies, provokingly. "Where is that former firmness, with which you made yourself a nuisance to the whole of Rome reviving the Lucilian art (*'nimium,' ait, 'formidolosus; ubi illa quondam constantia, in qua multo sale urbem defricans*[45] *Lucilianum quippiam rettulisti'*)?"[46]

The allusion to Lucilius and Rome refers to Horace's *Sat.* 1.10.3f.[47] There Horace takes up his critique of Lucilius' achievements as a satirist first developed in his *Sat.* 1.4. (He will again resume it in *Sat.* 2.1.) For Horace, as for the majority of the ancients, Lucilius, who lived in the sec-

---

[45] Cf. Horat. *Sat.* 1.10.3-4: *Urbem defricuit.* Despite *orbem defricans* in some important Mss (*Turic. Aug.* 41, *saec.* IX; *Paris. lat.* 1868, *saec.* IX and *Augustodun.* 17A, *saec.* X) we follow Hilberg (CSEL 55) for reasons of textual criticism. Cf. however Wiesen (1964) 85, n. 66, who suggests that Jerome himself exchanged the letters in order to exaggerate his importance as a satirist, and, in regard to Jerome's literary background, Emily Gowers' remark in The Oxford Classical Dictionary ([3]1996, 1359) that already with Juvenal, who lived at the turn of the second century A.D., satire took in "not only a bloated metropolis but also the ends of the earth."

[46] *Epist.* 117.1.2 (CSEL 55, 423). According to Wiesen (1964, 85) this is a programmatic remark concerning the letter as a whole. By laying it into his petitioner's mouth, Jerome defends himself not only against the criticism likely to be provoked by the polemics and sarcasm in this letter (*epist.* 117), but also and in the first place against the criticism he had suffered already for his verbal excesses in *epist.* 22.

[47] On the motif of *Lucilius aemulus* in this context cf. the classic study of G.C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace. A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (= *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature* 7, Madison 1920), repr. Hildesheim 1966.

ond century B.C., was the father of Roman satire.[48] Although he also criticizes Lucilius for his rude language, his verbosity, his use of Greek, the unrefined style and literary structure of his verse, his unconcealed attacks against contemporaries and the blending in of autobiographical details into his texts, he nevertheless praises him as a model to be imitated and defends the literary form of satire against its enemies. Jerome could have alluded to both aspects. As mentioned above in note 25, he may have thought of *epist.* 117 as being, in comparison with *epist.* 22, a more refined type of satire, like an Horatian satire compared to a Lucilian one. But he also could have thought of Horace's apology of the art of satire against contemporaries reacting savagely against being attacked in satires. In *Sat.* 2.1.63-68 Horace stresses that even the most prominent Romans of his time were in fact honoured by being made fun of in Lucilius's satires.[49] Jerome's experience in Rome in 384 was quite different. And there is yet another possibility of how to understand Jerome's remark concerning the "Lucilian art." The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 2.19 (cf. also 1.24), dating approximately from the second decade of the first century B.C., relates the following story. An actor, who had been attacked by Lucilius in a satire, retaliated by making fun of Lucilius on stage (*[Lucilium] in scaena nominatim laeserat*). This time Lucilius did not fight back by writing a satire but by taking the actor to court accusing him of insult. But the case, Lucilius' *actio iniuriarium*, was turned down. The actor went free. Lucilius, however, faced public ridicule. Had he not proved to be a bad satirist by trying to avoid what he expected others to take from himself? It is not clear how far this story pertains to facts. One of Lucilius' own extant lines might allude to it.[50] But in any case, if Jerome knew it, he may well have interpreted it with regard to himself when quoting from Horace. Four centuries after Horace and one more after Lucilius he would have used Horace's account, almost as if wondering: "Will I equal Horace as a satirist or end up, as Lucilius does in this story, in ridicule?"[51] In Rome in 384 he had in fact faced a fate similar to, or even worse than that of Lucilius related in the account of

---

[48] For example, for Martial *Spect.* 12.94.17, writing satire was equivalent to becoming another Lucilius: *Audemus saturas: Lucilius esse laboras.*

[49] Cf. Horat. *Sat.* 2.1.67f.: *Num Laelius . . . ingenio offensi . . .?*

[50] Cf. Lucil. *Sat.* 11.424: *Non laudare hominem quemquam, neque mu facere, inquam.* On the story from *Rhet. Herenn.* cf. C. Cichorius, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*, Berlin 1908, 59-61; on Lucilius in general, with further literature, M. Coffey, art. Lucilius 1, in: The Oxford Classical Dictionary ([3]1996, 887).

[51] On details in this regard cf. Wiesen (1964) 256f.

the *Rhet. Herenn.* His satirical attacks against members of the ecclesiastical establishment had turned nastily against himself. At the death of his protector Damasus he had had to leave the city.[52] In *epist.* 117 he lets his author allude further to this memory of his: "Accusing others I found myself accused. The lot ganged up against me and refuted me and as the proverb says: I wished I had never been born. The walls echoed their abuses against me and the 'themes of their drinking psalms' (Ps 68:13)."[53] And again, this is not just a quote from Ps 68:13,[54] it recalls the theme of God's faithful servant according to Second- or Deutero-Isaiah.[55] Although innocent the servant has to suffer abuse and denial from his own people before he can save them. Early Christian exegesis applied this theme to the figure of the suffering Christ.[56] Jerome lets his author not go quite as far as to suggest directly that he himself or his narrator is to be identified with the suffering Christ. But resuming to the literary device of quoting literally from the Bible, an exception to be noticed in this text, he is not very far from doing precisely that. In any case, he recalls his past experience as an excuse for not writing any more on matters of ascetic discipline, at least at this stage in the letter. Having made his petitioner compare him with Lucilius, he recalls the significance of Lucilius' art and fate, compares it with the one of the narrator in his letter and lets the latter pretend to have drawn his conclusions. At the end of that section the narrator quotes from Ps 140/1,3-4: " 'Better a lock on one's mouth and the door of one's

---

[52] On the biographical details cf. Kelly (1975) 104-115.

[53] *Epist.* 117.1.3 (CSEL 55, 423): *Psallebant contra me, qui bibebant uinum.* Cf. Ps 68,13: *In me psallebant, qui bibebant uinum.*

[54] Unusually, as literal quotations are rare in *epist.* 117, which, again, may be due to the circumstances related above, note 25.

[55] The passage most relevant for Jerome's reception of the theme is Is 52:13-53:12. As a classic exegetical account, which is also strong on the aspect of reception, cf. C.F. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah,* London ²1956; on recent research cf. B. Janowski & P. Stuhlmacher, eds., *Der leidende Gottesknecht. Jesaia 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (= *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 14), Tübingen 1996 (literature!), with an account of the early patristic reception by Ch. Markschies on pp. 251-271.

[56] Jerome himself proves a leading exegete in this respect, despite conflicting textual evidence between the LXX- and Hebraica-versions of the passage. Examples for his treatment of the topic can be found in his *comm. in Is* 3.9.6/7, 14.53.8/10, 15.55.4/5, 17.63.8/10, 18.66.5 (CChr.SL 73/A, 126.32f., 594.100f., 622.28f., 726.21, 774.63), *comm. in Matth* 26.56 (CChr.SL 77, 259), *comm. in Ps* 68 (CChr.SL 72, 215f.), and, of course, in his Vulgate version of the Old Testament, for example Is 53:4: *Dolores nostros ipse portauit.*

lips shut' than a heart inclined to evil words and a tendency to lapse, while criticising others' vices, oneself into the vice of vile gossip."[57]

Thus once more: (1) With this fictional dialogue Jerome refers to his past experience in Rome in 384. In itself this can only be concluded from evidence outside this text. *Epist.* 117 only provides allusions. By presenting his memory as a piece of fiction, Jerome at the same time reveals and conceals it. The holy man who is visited by the petitioner, the author of the letter to the two women in Gaul, is not simply Jerome himself but a literary creation of his. (2) On that assumption it seems that not only does Jerome let this author claim or pretend that the violent reactions against his satirical attacks (of the like of *epist.* 22) in Rome in 384 silenced him once and for all, he also declares this silence now to be a kind of ascetic virtue. In return his fictional petitioner expresses his, Jerome's, real intention, namely that in this particular case it may be more virtuous to serve the brethren by breaking the silence than by keeping it, while, by doing so by means of fiction, that silence is not even really broken; for again, what is revealed in the letter is at the same time also concealed, as the letter is a piece of fiction packed with satire. (3) Moreover, by addressing two fictional women anonymous—or, at the level of fiction, by keeping the addressees' names secret—the fictional author may go ahead with satire and yet avoid scandal or, at the level of reality, another crisis in Jerome's life.[58]

The literary theory behind this, put as a general insight in the form of a concrete but fictional story,[59] is: Jerome intends to use satire, but not the Lucilian way, as in *epist.* 22, a lengthy, rude and rashly composed text, with which he had made himself a nuisance to the whole of Rome (*urbem/orbem defricans*). Rather, with *epist.* 117 and its sophisticated literary techniques comprising fiction and satire including the reflection on it, he not only wants to avoid scandal this time,[60] he wants the letter to impress

---

[57] *Epist.* 117.1.3 (CSEL 55, 423): *Rectius esse arbitrans ponere custodiam ori meo et ostium munitum labiis meis, quam declinare cor in uerba malitiae.* Cf. here the reminiscence to Ps 140:3-4: *Pone domine custodiam ori meo et ostium circumstantiae labiis meis. Non declines cor meum in uerba malitiae.*

[58] In fact, by using fiction, the real Jerome is not even breaking the silence he lets his fictional author pretend he wants to keep. Everything remains hidden by being said in the open.

[59] Cf. also *epist.* 117.1.4 (CSEL 55, 424): *Nec priuata correptio generalem doctrinam facit, cum aut rarus aut nullus sit, qui sub huius culpae reatum cadat.*

[60] Scandal must be avoided this time. To indicate this Jerome lets the author warn his petitioner at one point to keep the content of the letter secret. Again, against the

even more than *epist.* 22 as outstanding in literary brilliance as well as credible, truthful and effective,[61] and that despite, or, in the light of his literary theory, precisely because of its being a piece of fiction.[62]

Satire in the Initial Address to Both Women (c. 2)

This somewhat ambivalent intention can be felt throughout the letter, as it evolves from now on, starting from the initial address to both women (c. 2). Like the *prooemium*, it culminates in a quote from a classical writing, this time a comedy, Terence's *Hautontimoroumenos*. In a strange mixture of irony and seriousness Jerome's author implores both women to put an end to their escapades and move together again. He insists that he is far from accusing them of leading a sinful life. But, he continues, he is worried about their reputation.[63] He does, he claims, not believe that they have actually fallen prey to sin already. Otherwise, he continues, he would abstain from writing altogether, knowing that he would "tell his tale to deaf ears."[64] If nonetheless his style became a bit aggressive, he concludes, they may forgive him. His worry, he adds, had made him write so.

The rhetoric of this passage is deeply ambiguous. Jerome lets his author assume what he repeatedly denies, that far from being serious religious persons the two women are about to get involved in love affairs. The quote from the *Haut.* clearly points in that direction. In that play a fluffed youngster called Clitiphon has a secret love affair with the extravagant *uirgo* Bacchis. The warnings of his worried father are like the quoted "tales told to deaf ears."

The plot of *epist.* 117 resembles that of the *Haut.* in many ways. The younger addressee of the letter is a *uirgo* in a Christian context. Her extravagance consists in wanting to stay separate from her mother and set

---

background of "Rome 384" that would have been necessary at the level of reality, if the letter had not been a piece of fiction. On the assumption that it was a piece of fiction, it was to be considered necessary at the level of fiction only. Cf. *epist.* 117.1.5 (CSEL 55, 424): *Nam et epistulae transmarinae sunt.* And, in the petitioner's direction: *te autem moneo, ut clam sermonem hunc habeas.*

[61] *Epist.* 117.1.5 (CSEL 55, 424): *Specialiter sermo dictatus raros potest inuenire, quos mordeat.*

[62] Cf. *epist.* 117.1.4 (CSEL 55, 423): *"Non est," inquit, "detrahere uerum dicere . . ."* Jerome is able to let his author say that (and mean it) without running danger of getting involved in another scandal.

[63] *Epist.* 117.2.1 (CSEL 55, 424): . . . *ne ceteri suspicentur.* The motif of the *fama* is also taken up in cc. 6.2 (CSEL 55, 428), 8.2 (CSEL 55, 431) and 9 (CSEL 55, 431f.).

[64] Terent. *Haut.* 222; *epist.* 117.2.1 (CSEL 55, 424): . . . *surdis narrare fabulam.*

up a household of her own together with her spiritual boyfriend, who is even younger than her. Like Bacchis and Clitiphon the Christian *uirgo* and her *clericus* get involved with each other in a foolish and irresponsible manner. The younger woman's brother in *epist.* 117 takes the role of Clitiphon's father. He worries about the family fortune and his sister's *fama.* He begs Jerome's *auctor in fabula* to help him. But the latter is not very optimistic—over against him, that is to say, the (male) petitioner;[65] for over against the women he sets off playing the charming man of letters, as if it was but a tiny problem, easy to be solved by an act of reconciliation, to move back in again together.[66]

Both attitudes are deeply satirical. Over against his petitioner Jerome lets his author express contempt regarding the women's behaviour. Over against the women, however, he lets him at first be charming and only gradually reveal his basic attitude, when he announces that he might become a bit sarcastic in the process of his address[67] and quotes a proverb: "Festering meat needs cutting out with knife and branding iron, poison is best neutralised by poison."[68]

Jerome lets his author leave no doubts about the basic direction of his arguments. He polemicises against the behaviour of the two women and he does so in the following chapters (3-10) by concentrating on the younger one.

The Address to the Daughter (c. 3)

Ten months, he begins his plea, she, the daughter, had spent in her mother's womb.[69] Could she not now endure but one more night with her in one cubicle (*in uno cubiculo*)? Again one wonders how sharing a cubicle fits together with each of them being able to afford own households including domestic staff. The same can be said about the author's next point: "When you were a baby," he writes, "you were daily carried about by your mother. She fed you and bore the less agreeable aspects of your childlike behaviour. She changed and washed your dirty nappies and even

---

[65] Cf. *epist.* 117.1.5 (CSEL 55, 424): *Ego uerba perdiderim . . .*

[66] Cf. also *epist.* 117.11.2 (CSEL 55, 433).

[67] *Epist.* 117.2.1 (CSEL 55, 424).

[68] *Epist.* 117.2.1 (CSEL 55, 424): *Putridae carnes ferro curantur et cauterio, uenena serpentino pelluntur antidoto.* On more details cf. again Wiesen (1964) 258.

[69] *Epist.* 117.3.1 (CSEL 55, 425).

soiled herself with your excrements."[70] That again is a cliché. If the women could afford their own houses, the mother would also have been able to afford for herself a maid servant to take over the less agreeable tasks of her motherhood. The author then closes this first chapter of his address to the younger woman with another one of his ambiguous allusions: Why, he asks, does she shun the protected atmosphere of her mother's house? As a virgin, she should rather enjoy it. But if she had ceased to be a virgin, why does she not marry?[71]

Fictional Dialogues with the Daughter (cc. 4.1, 5.1, 8.1)

To relieve his reader a bit from such penetrating dialectics, Jerome lets his author continue with a dialogue between himself and the addressee. It takes place at a different level from the one with the petitioner in the *prooemium*, which is part of the letter's narrative framework (cc. 1 and 12). This dialogue, which comes in three pieces (cc. 4.1, 5.1 and 8.1) is part of the narrative itself and thus constitutes in a certain way a third layer of fiction (beneath the letter's narrative framework, cc. 1 and 12, and the letter itself, cc. 2-11, as an address to the two women).

Unlike in the dialogue between the author and the petitioner in the *prooemium*, the addressee is now no longer talked about. The author of the letter does now no longer *say* (be it to the fictional petitioner or to the real reader of the letter) that she is stubborn and obstinate, he *shows* her to be that by letting her talk. And what she says is Jerome at his very best (or, for that matter, worst): "My pure conscience is enough to me. I have God as a judge . . . I am not concerned with people's gossip." This is a combination of quotes from Cicero and St. Paul.[72] The author's retort, too, is taken from St. Paul (Rom 12:17): "Not only in God's but also in people's eyes you should display yourself as someone who is striving for the good."—"But," Jerome lets his author make the virgin ask once more,[73] "is it then an offence to stay with an holy man (*sanctus uir*)?" Only to make him reply with a last quote, again from a classical comedy, Plautus' *Poenulus*:

---

[70] *Epist.* 117.4.1 (CSEL 55, 426).
[71] *Epist.* 117.3.2 (CSEL 55, 425).
[72] *Epist.* 117.4.4 (CSEL 55, 427); cf. 1 Co 4:4; Cic. *epist. Att.* 12.28.2.
[73] *Epist.* 117.5.1 (CSEL 55, 427).

"[With this remark] you grab me by my neck and drag me away to court.[74] Should I agree with what I disagree?"

The *Poen.* tells of the tangles of the love affairs of two *hetaerae.* Lucus, their pimp, wants to drag the innocent slave of one of their customers to court. The customer is Agorastocles, the young fluffed Poenulus, after whom the play is named. The younger one of the two *hetaerae*, Anterastulis, is in love with him. Yet he is playing games with her. In her despair she marries the bearish and surly, but loyal and faithful veteran Antamunides. Once more the outline of the plot resembles to a great extent that of *epist.* 117. Jerome presents his narrator as the innocent victim of intrigue in the context of two love affairs. His only intention, he says, was to keep the young folk out of mischief. In return, he feels, he is treated with ingratitude, unjustly accused of interfering in other people's matters and (figuratively) dragged to court, like the fool in the play. But, he mutters, it will soon turn out who the true fool is in this affair. He is convinced, the young woman's fancy for the even younger and hardly serious cleric[75] will end up in tears, like Anterastulis' affair with Agorastocles. How, he wonders, could she possibly prefer that fop or ruffian[76] to her gentle brother? The way in which her brother reacts to this,[77] makes one conclude, he says, how hollow her claims regarding her new way of life really are. They are, he continues, guided merely by a disordered proclivity towards extravagance.

Satire, Sarcasm and Plea (cc. 4-10)

To illustrate his point, Jerome lets his narrator paint the lavish picture of a luxurious picnic in the countryside. This happens once more in contradiction to the introductory remarks of the letter, which suggested a lower class setting of the addressees.[78] Jerome himself, of course, was acquainted

---

[74] *Epist.* 117.5.1 (CSEL 55, 427); cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 790: *Obtorto collo me in ius trahis.*

[75] Cf. *epist.* 117.10.1 (CSEL 55, 432). She is 25 (*uiginti et quinque*), he might still be a teenager (*necdum bene barbatulum*).

[76] *Epist.* 117.8.1 (CSEL 55, 430): *Trossulus* (*Paris. lat.* 1868, *saec.* IX: *torosulus*). Cf. Wiesen (1964) 86. 215: "The word *trossulus*, meaning literally a cavalryman, is a traditional satiric term for dandy. It is used in this sense by Persius and Seneca." Cf. Persius 1.82; Seneca *epist.* 76.2; 87.9. For Jerome cf. also *Adu. Iouinian.* 2.14: *Formosuli nostri et torosuli.* Cf. Wiesen (1964) 215: "It is possible however that Vallarsi's reading *torosulus* (little and muscular) should be changed to *trossulus*, which is indeed the reading of the manuscripts."

[77] Cf. *epist.* 117.8.1 (CSEL 55, 430) on the brother's tears.

[78] Cf. above in the third section on the *exordium* of the letter in the light of satire.

with such luxurious settings, not to talk about his ability to quote from classical authors to enrich and illustrate his picture. But what is his intention? What does he want to show and to what avail? He lets his author imagine how the young woman attends to such parties as a *uirgo* in her apparently seductive outfit being an easy prey for flirtatious upper class dandies.[79] As even worse he considers the possibility that she is attending such parties together with her lover (*cum amasio tuo*). At this point he lets his author or narrator call him just that. Her reputation (*fama*), thus his conclusion, would by now be ruined. The letter, too, seems to have come a long way by now from the niceties of the initial address in c. 2.

Resuming to the exaggerated mannerisms of late ancient prose style, Jerome lavishes in painting the picture in which he wants his audience to imagine his fictional author's addressee being caught up, alone, helpless, exposed to her own vices and, even more so, to those of the worldly crowd around her. A fluff beard would swarm around her "seducing her while being himself seduced." As a starter she would see other couples kissing each other. She would be forced to eat meat. With all kinds of tricks they would try to lure her into the bath. The musicians would seduce her with their tunes and the suggestive texts of their songs. Since she was alone with nobody to protect her, men would approach her with much less restraint than they would approach married women.[80] It seems that Jerome simply liked to tell such stories.[81] He could not resist either telling the one about the old and honourable man, hardly held together by his bones (*ossibus uix haerens*),[82] who was inflamed with mad desire for a silly young thing. In connection with a quote from Vergil's *Aeneis* it seems to be a fabrication circulating among old school boys.[83] Augustine, too, had a version of it in store.[84] Jerome lets his narrator claim to be concerned about the

---

[79] Cf. *epist.* 117.6 (CSEL 55, 429f.) and Wiesen (1964) 143f.

[80] In c. 6.4 Jerome alludes to what kind of songs would have been sung at such parties, like adaptations of the story of the Sirenes causing death to those who, seduced by their beautiful singing, would come too close to them (*sirenarum nautas in saxa praecipites*; cf. *Odyss.* 12.39-54. 158-198), or of the magic effects of Orpheus' singing (cf. Eurip. *Bacch.* 562f.; *Iph. Aul.* 1211f.).

[81] On other examples cf. Kelly (1975) 276.

[82] A quote from Verg. *Eclog.* 3.102: *Vix ossibus haerent.*

[83] In *epist.* 117.7.1 (CSEL 55, 429f.) Jerome claims to have heard it at school. With *spirantia . . . aera* he refers to Verg. *Aen.* 6.847.

[84] *C. Iul.* 3.11.22 (PL 44, 713): *Nuntiatus est nobis senex octoginta et quatuor agens annos, qui religiose cum coniuge religiosa iam uiginti quinque annos uixerat continenter, ad libidinem sibi emisse Lyristriam.*

young woman's chastity, but what he actually does is to describe how he imagines her to lose it. Her youth, he writes, her health, her beauty, her looking well fed, her habit to participate in banquets and attend the public bath, her acquaintance with married women,[85] let alone the young men who make her compliments arousing her secret vanity, which would prove the more attractive to them, as it was hidden underneath a virgin's black habit, which, with her playful modesty, would be revealing more than it would be hiding, her way to gird herself, to emphasize the beauty of her waist, her way of opening up her hair so it would touch her shoulders, her habit of elegantly exposing her naked shoulders, all that would corrupt her ascetic life and ultimately ruin her *fama*. And he is anxious to point out every single unsavoury detail that might contribute to that process.[86]

All this, he concludes, would prove the worse, as her boyfriend had already taken over her household. He imagines how the irresponsible young man was administering the cash and giving orders to the domestic staff. The latter was already spreading rumours: He had once called for a midwife, had nursed her, when she was taken ill of whatever it may have been. He had warmed her linen, pleated her bandages and helped her with the chamber-pot.[87] And to leave no doubts about the level of conversation he has now reached Jerome lets his author close this passage with a quote from Ier 3:3: "After all, your face has become that of a whore. You won't even blush anymore."[88]

Address to the Mother (c. 11)

The final passage, addressed to the mother, comes back, despite the harsh verdict on the daughter, rather inconsistently and apparently without satirical intentions, with some reconciling remarks concerning ways in which the situation could possibly be resolved.[89] Thus Jerome's narrator

---

[85] Cf. *epist.* 22.16.1 (CSEL 54, 163): *Nolo habeas consortia matronarum.*

[86] True to the satirical character of the text there is, therefore, a clear discrepancy between what Jerome lets his narrator claim is his intention and what the reader is actually presented with. The proclaimed intention is to encourage a virtuous life, the presentation, in contrast, offers nothing but vice.

[87] Cf. *epist.* 117.8 (CSEL 55, 430f.).

[88] *Epist.* 117.9.4 (CSEL 54, 432): *Facies meritricis facta est tibi, nescis erubescere.*

[89] And this although Jerome lets the daughter describe her mother's lifestyle in a no less flattering way than he lets his author describe her's. *Epist.* 117.4.1 (CSEL 55, 426): *Res saeculi cupit, amat diuitias, ignorat ieiunium, oculos stibio linit, uult compta procedere et nocet*

seriously suggests that the ascetic family should move together once more in the original household or any of the two women should welcome their male relative in her respective household to enable him to carry on the patrilineal family tradition, as long as they would only cease to stay with those strangers.

In the context of *epist.* 117 such seriousness comes with a surprise. Is it not likely that it is just used as another satirical device? Only in a wider context it may be interpreted as pointing towards a genuine positive attitude of Jerome's towards women (for example, if we extrapolate, again, the findings of *epist.* 117 towards those of *epist.* 22). But however that attitude of Jerome's as a spiritual teacher and theorist of the ascetic life of women may have been reputed throughout the centuries, very little of it has been made directly accessible by Jerome himself in the concluding sections of this letter.

Final Remarks

To conclude: Against the background of two earlier attempts at interpreting *epist.* 117 the assumption was made in this article that *epist.* 117 is a work of satire in which fiction is used to refer to the historical personalities, circumstances and events from which it may have emerged, namely Jerome's crisis in and departure from Rome in 384/5, especially in the light of *epist.* 22, his relationship with Paula and Eustochium, his attitudes towards asceticism and the practice of *subintroductae.*

As a satire, *epist.* 117 is a piece of prose fiction with several narrative levels: (1) In cc. 4.1, 5.1 and 8.1 a dialogue takes place between Jerome's fictional author or narrator and the younger addressee, who is presented as retorting the author's polemical and satirical challenges; (2) The whole letter is framed by a dialogue between that author and his petitioner; (3) The letter itself, as a whole, is a dialogue between the author and two women who may represent an historically real public, to whom Jerome's crisis in 384/5 following the publication of *epist.* 22 and also the practice

---

proposito meo nec possum cum huiuscemodi uiuere. However, the daughter is doing this in defense of her decision to leave her mother's house and move in together with her spiritual partner. Obviously, her description of her mother's life style is not intended by the author to be taken literally. It is introduced as the satirically exaggerated report of a rebellious daughter. On the other hand, the mother is charged with nothing more than the usual life style of an upper class lady. Once more, the semantic value of the text is in danger of getting lost in the ambivalence of its pragmatics.

of *subintroductae* must have meant something, not to talk about the ability of the members of such a circle to understand and appreciate Roman satire.

In this context *epist.* 117 might be called a *retractatio* to *epist.* 22, maybe even with the same historically real addressee. But Jerome does not want to go too public on this. He explicitely wants to avoid conflict and scandal. As a result, there are indeed only a few hints at the historical reality behind the fiction of *epist.* 117 and despite its brilliance in style and structure the letter leaves the reader with the impression created by those last remarks of Jerome's in c. 12, the concluding part of the letter's narrative framework, that it was scribbled in a hurry and as the rhetorical or literary finger exercise of an author who, one might conclude, may have pretended to have better things to do than to revive the Lucilian art—although, as becomes clear from the text itself, he could present himself as well able to do precisely that.[90]

King's College, *London*

[90] I am grateful to Graham Gould who invited me to deliver a modified version of this article as a paper at the Patristic seminar at King's College London during Lent term 1997 and to David Robertson for kindly reading it and suggesting corrections.

NOTITIOLAE QUODVULTDEANAE*

VON

WOLFGANG STROBL

Die kritische Herausgabe der dem nordafrikanischem Bischof Quodvultdeus zugeschriebenen Werke darf als ruhmvolles Lebenswerk des bekannten französischen Patristikers R. Braun gewertet werden. Indem R. Braun die richtungweisenden Impulse früherer Gelehrter (Morin, Franses, Schepens) aufnahm, konnte er zunächst im Jahre 1964 in den Bänden 101/102 der *Sources Chrétiennes*[1] eine mit einer umfangreichen, noch heute grundlegenden Einführung ausgestattete Ausgabe des *Liber Promissionum et Praedictionum Dei*, des exegetischen Hauptwerkes des Kirchenschriftstellers, vorlegen.[2] 12 Jahre später erschien im Band 60 des *Corpus Christianorum*[3] eine allen höheren Erfordernissen der Textkritik genügende Ausgabe des *Liber* und der dem Erzbischof Karthagos und Primas Africae seit Germain Morin[4] zugeschriebenen 12 Predigten.[5]

---

* Für die kritische Durchsicht des Manuskripts bin ich Herrn Prof. W. Speyer zu größtem Dank verpflichtet.

[1] Quodvultdeus, Livre des promesses et des prédictions de Dieu. Introduction, texte latin, traduction et notes. Hg. R. Braun, *Sources Chrétiennes* 101-102, Paris 1964.

[2] Das Werk hat in Fachkreisen weithin positive und wohlmeinende Kritik erfahren: J. André, *Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 40, 1966, 184-185. P. Antin, *Latomus* 23, 1964, 841-842. M. Bogaert, *Revue Bénédictine* 75, 1965, 177-178. P.-T. Camelot, *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 49, 1965, 730-731. J. Daniélou, *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 54, 1966, 323-326. D.O.R., *Irénikon* 38, 1965, 125. É. des Places, *Biblica* 46, 1965, 474-475. J. Granarolo, *Revue de la Franco-Ancienne* 147, 1964, 250-251. J.-C. Guy, *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique* 41, 1965, 204-205. G. Mathon, *Bulletin de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 11, 1970, 34-35. M.J. Meunier, *Les Études Classiques* 33, 1965, 210-211. A. Orbe, *Gregorianum* 47, 1966, 548-549. P. Petitmengin, *Revue des Études Latines* 47, 1969, 563-566. T. Špidlík, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31, 1965, 237-238. P. Tombeur, *Revue Belge de Philologie et Historie* 44, 1966, 1314-1316. L.-M. Verheijen, *L'Antiquité Classique* 34, 1965, 282-283.

[3] *Opera Quodvultdeo Carthaginiensi episcopo tributa*, Hg. R. Braun, CCL 60, Turnhout 1976.

[4] G. Morin, Pour une future édition des opuscules de S. Quodvultdeus, évêque de Carthage au V^e^ siècle: *Revue Bénédictine* 31, 1914, 156-162.

[5] Auch dieses Werk stieß bei den Kennern, die es durchwegs als exzellentes Arbeitsmittel

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Ein die Biographie dieses Kirchenvaters angehendes Problem betrifft die Frage nach dem Beginn seines Episkopats. In der patristischen Literatur[6] wird weitgehend das Jahr 437 (recht willkürlich) als Anfang seines bischöflichen Wirkens ausgewiesen. Vorsichtigere Forscher geben als mögliche Zeitspanne

---

fur den Quodvultdeusforscher empfehlen, auf breite Zustimmung: M. Bogaert, *Revue Bénédictine* 87, 1977, [38-39]. L. Brix, *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 25, 1979, 372-373. Y.-M. Duval, *Latomus* 38, 1979, 251-254. J. Fontaine, *Revue des Études Latines* 54, 1976, 398-400. C.P. Hammond, *Journal of Theological Studies* 29, 1978, 569-575. M. Herren, *Scriptorium* 33, 1979, 155-157. C. Kannengiesser, *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 66, 1978, 301-302. H. Kraft, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 107, 1982, 125-127. R. Lorenz, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 89, 1978, 412-413. M. Marin, *Vetera Christianorum* 14, 1977, 210-211. C. Martin, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 99, 1977, 602-603. A. Orbe, *Gregorianum* 59, 1978, 625-627. Auch M. Simonetti, *Studi storico-religiosi* 1, 1977, 398-399.

Kritik an der Zuordnung der Predigten hat bis zuletzt der italienische Forscher M. Simonetti geäußert: M. Simonetti, Studi sulla letteratura cristiana d'Africa in età vandalica: *Rendiconti dell' Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere. Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche* 83, 1950, 407-424. Ders., Note sul testo di alcuni passi di opere attribuite a Quodvultdeus: *Rivista di filologia e istruzione classica* 106, 1978, 291-299. Ders., Qualche riflessione su Quodvultdeus di Cartagine: *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 14, 1978, 201-207. Ders., *La produzione letteraria latina fra romani e barbari (sec. V-VIII)*, Roma 1986 (= Sussidi patristici 3), 35-39.

[6] So etwa: B. Altaner/A. Stuiber, *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*, Freiburg/Basel/Wien [8]1978, Ndr. ebd. 1993, 449. D. Ambrasi, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* 10, 1968, 1335. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur.* Bd. 4 Das fünfte Jahrhundert mit Einschluß der syrischen Literatur des vierten Jahrhunderts, Freiburg 1924, 522. H. Bihlmeyer, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Kirchliches Handlexikon* 2, 1912, 1648. R. Braun, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 12,2 (1986), 2883. P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris [3]1964, 126. E. Dekkers (Hg.), *Clavis patrum latinorum*, Steenbrugis [3]1995, 156. H. Kraft, *Kirchenväterlexikon*, München 1966, 444. P. de Labriolle, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne* 2 (Revue et augmenté par G. Bardy), Paris [3]1947, 673. H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel.* Freiburg [4]1995, 725. P. Langlois, Art. Afrika II (literaturgeschichtlich), *RAC* Suppl. Lief. 1-2, Stuttgart 1985, 203. A. Lippold, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Der Kleine Pauly* 4 (1975), 1322. A. Manser, Art. Quodvultdeus: *LThK* 8, [1]1936, 596. M.P. McHugh, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* 2, [2]1997, 970. S.A. Morcelli, *Africa Christiana* 3, Brixiae 1817, 141. U. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana.* Volume III. La letteratura dei secoli V e VI da Agostino a Gregorio Magno. Parte I., Torino 1932, 707. *Quodvultdeus, Promesse e predizioni di Dio.* Traduzione, introduzione e note a cure di A.V. Nazzaro, Roma 1989 (= Collana di testi patristici 82), 10-11. G. Rauschen, *Patrologie. Die Schriften der Kirchenväter und ihr Lehrgehalt* [10./11. Aufl. bearb. v. B. Altaner], Freiburg 1931, 357. V. Saxer, *Saints anciens d'Afrique du Nord*, Città del Vaticano 1979, 184. V. Saxer, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Dizionario patristico e di antichità christiana* 2, Roma 1983, 2966. V. Saxer, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du christianisme ancien* 2, 1990, 2152. M. Schuster, Art. Quodvultdeus: *PW* 1, 47 (1963), 1396. A. Stuiber, Art. Quodvultdeus: *LThK* 8, [2]1963, 956. R. Vander Plaetse/C. Beukers, *De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum liber*

für den Amtsantritt den Zeitraum zwischen den Jahren 431 und 439 an.[7] An diese Vorgabe anknüpfend wollen wir nun den Nachweis erbringen, daß Quodvultdeus im Jahr 432 oder 433 sein Bischofsamt angetreten hat.

Über die Abfolge der Oberhirten auf dem Bischofsstuhl der Kirche Karthagos in dieser Zeit lassen die Quellen keine Zweifel offen:[8] der Diakon Quodvultdeus folgte Bischof Capreolus in seinem Amt nach und überließ nach einer längeren, auf die politischen Turbulenzen zurückzuführenden Sedisvakanz im Jahre 454 Deogratias das Amt des Oberhirten. Nachdem Karthago am 19. Oktober 439 von den Vandalenhorden Geiserichs eingenommen war,[9] mußte der Augustinusschüler in seiner Funktion als Bischof das Land auf nahezu schon fahruntauglichen Schiffen verlassen.[10] Da sich Capreolus in einem an die Brüder in Ephesos gerichteten Brief[11] bei Theodosius II. für seine Abwesenheit beim Konzil mit der schwierigen politischen Lage in seiner Diözese entschuldigt, steht fest, daß dieser im Jahre 431 Bischof von Karthago war.

---

unus, CCL 46, Turnhout 1969, 265. Ein einziger Gelehrter nennt das Jahr 435: Y.-M. Duval, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Catholicisme hier-au-jourd'hui-demain* 12, 1990, 412.

[7] C. Courtois, *Victor de Vita et son œuvre. Étude critique.* Alger 1954, 61, Anm. 305 "C'est donc au plus tôt en 432 et au plus tard en 439 que Quodvultdeus fut élevé au siège de Carthage." H.R. Drobner, Art. Quodvultdeus: *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 7, 1994, 1138 "Zwischen 431 und 439 wurde er Bischof von Karthago." A. Mandouze, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire.* Bd. 1: Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-533), Paris 1982, 948 "il est cependant impossible de situer son accession au siège de Carthage de façon plus précise qu'à une date intermédiaire entre 431 et 439." Dann aber auch, sich selbst widersprechend: 190 "il faut vraisemblablement reconnaître C.[apreolus]—plutôt que son succeseur Quodvultdeus—dans l'évêque dont le nom n'est pas précisé mais qui, à Carthage en 434, est l'instrument d'une guérison présentée comme miraculeuse."

[8] Victor Tonnensis, Chronicon a. 463: Carthaginensis ecclesiae post Capreolum Quodvultdeus et post Quodvultdeus atque Deogratias, Eugenius episcopus ordinatur (MGH AA 11. *Chronica minora* 2, Hg. T. Mommsen, Berlin 1894, Ndr. München 1981, 187). Vgl. P.B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*, Regensburg 1873/1886, Ndr. Graz 1957, 463.

[9] Ausführlicher dazu C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, Paris 1955, Ndr. Aalen 1964, 171.

[10] Victor Vitensis 1,12 [6/7], lin. 23; 1-3: Quid multa? Post has truces impietates insaniae ipsam urbem maximam Carthaginem Geisericus tenuit et intravit, et antiquam illam ingenuam ac nobilem libertatem in servitudinem redegit. 1,15 [8], lin. 3-6: Tunc vero memoratae urbis episcopum id est Carthaginis, deo et hominibus manifestum, nomine Quodvultdeus, et maximam turbam clericorum navibus fractis inpositam nudos atque expoliatos expelli praecepit. (*Victoris episcopi Vitensis historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae*, Hg. M. Petschenig, CSEL 7, Wien 1881). Courtois (1955) a.O. 175 hingegen meint, daß die Verbannung kurz nach 439 oder nach 442 erfolgt sei.

[11] PL 53, coll. 843-847. Vgl. dazu Mandouze a.O. 189-190.

Somit sind zunächst mit den Jahren 431 und 439 die termini post und ante quem festgesetzt. Die richtige Interpretation eines Abschnittes aus dem *Liber* soll uns nun einen Schritt weiterführen: Im 6. Kapitel von *Dimidium temporis*, dem 4. Buch des *Liber*, das von den Zeichen des Antichrist handelt, berichtet Quodvultdeus von einer Wunderheilung in seiner afrikanischen Heimatstadt Karthago, die sich unter dem Konsulat des Aspar abspielte:[12]

> Nostris quoque temporibus, Aspare v.c. cons. Karthagine constituto, hoc signum diabolicum monstruosumque quod illic accidit quis illius patriae civis ignorat? Quaedam iuvencula Araba natione, ancillae Dei habitum gestans, cum in balneo lavans simulacrum quoddam Veneris impudicae respiceret et seipsam, eique se consimilans, ut domicilium se diabolo praebuit. Statim ille leo qui rugiens circuit, quem quaerebat invenit. Meatus igitur gutturis ipsius occupans, nullum cibum nullumque potum traiciens per LXX ferme dies totidemque noctes, ieiunium sibi diabolus ex capto possessoque vase exhibuit. Hoc monstrum parentes puellae per tot dierum spatia auferri posse sperantes, dum iuge malum ulterius tolerare non possent, simul cum filia sese ingesserunt sacerdoti quae acta erant fideliter intimantes. Hoc tantum puella fatebatur avem quandam noctis medio apparere quae sibi ore nescio quid infunderet. [. . .] habito consilio, monasterio puellarum in quo reliquiae sancti Stephani sitae sunt, sacerdos puellam inclusit simul et praeposito commendavit. Illic prima tantum die apparuisse illam avem asseruit sibique increpasse quod neque fame neque siti compulsa illum appeteret locum quo sibi accedere non liceret. Per duas sane hebdomades nihil cibi vel poculi sumens in monasterio mansit. Accidit autem ut quintus decimus dominicus inlucesceret dies. Ascendentibus nobis cum sacerdote ut matutinum illic sacrificium solito offerretur, puellam praepositus ad altare perduxit [. . .]. Peracto itaque sacrificio, cum idem inter ceteras brevem particulam corporis domini tinctam a sacerdote perciperet, semihora mandens, traicere non valuit, necdum illo fugato [. . .]. Manu igitur faciem eius sustentante sacerdote ne sanctum proiceret, a quodam diacono suggestum est ut calicem salutarem gutturi eius pontifex applicaret. Quod ut factum est, statim ut locum illum quem diabolus obsederat, salvatoris imperio reliquit, sacramentum quod ore gestabat cum laude redemptoris transglutisse <se> puella clamavit. [. . .]

"Ebenso ereignete sich in unseren Tagen, als der erlauchte Aspar in Karthago als Konsul eingesetzt worden war, ein teuflisches und aufsehenerregendes Zeichen. Welcher Bürger dieses Landes wüßte nicht, was dort geschehen ist? Ein junges Mädchen arabischer Herkunft, das den Schleier genommen hatte, erblickte beim Baden in den Thermen ein Bildnis einer unzüchtigen Venus. Sie schaute auch sich selbst an und wollte es ihr gleichtun, bot sich dadurch aber dem Teufel als Wohnstätte an. In dem Augenblick

[12] Prom. 4,6,9-10 [196-197], lin. 20-72. Da sich der Abschnitt harmonisch in das Kapitel einfügt, ist eine spätere Interpolation oder Umarbeitung auszuschließen.

hatte jener, der wie ein brüllender Löwe herumschleicht, gefunden, was er suchte. Der Teufel besetzte nun den Durchgang ihres Rachens, ließ beinahe 70 Tage und ebensoviel Nächte lang keine Speise und keinen Trank durchdringen und verschaffte sich von dem Gefäß, das er erobert und in Besitz genommen hatte, zur eigenen Ehre eine Fastenzeit. Als die Eltern des Mädchens, die all diese Tage hindurch gehofft hatten, daß diese Unnatürlichkeit beseitigt werden könne, das Übel in einem fort nicht länger aushalten konnten, wandten sie sich mit der Tochter an einen Priester (*sacerdos*), dem sie den Vorfall wahrheitsgetreu schilderten. Nur soviel gestand das Mädchen: um Mitternacht erscheine ein Vogel, der ihr mit seinem Schnabel irgendeine Nahrung eingebe. [. . .] Nachdem man sich beraten hatte, ließ der Priester das Mädchen in das Frauenkloster einsperren, in dem die Reliquien des heiligen Stephanus verwahrt sind und vertraute sie dem Klostervorsteher (*praepositus*) an. Sie berichtete, daß ihr dort jener Vogel nur mehr am ersten Tag erschienen sei und sie heftig gescholten habe, daß sie weder von Hunger noch von Durst getrieben jenen Ort aufgesucht habe, zu dem ihm der Zugang verwehrt sei. 14 Tage blieb sie im Kloster, ohne Speise und Trank zu sich zu nehmen. Der 15. Tag brach herein, es traf sich, daß es ein Sonntag war. Wir (Quodvultdeus!) stiegen mit dem Priester hinauf, um wie gewöhnlich die Frühmesse zu feiern. Der Klostervorsteher führte das Mädchen zum Altar. [. . .] Als sie nach der Feier des Meßopfers mit den anderen ein kleines, in das Blut getauchtes Stück vom Leib Christi empfing, kaute sie eine halbe Stunde daran, konnte es aber nicht hinunterschlucken, da der Teufel noch nicht in die Flucht geschlagen war [. . .]. Wie nun der Priester mit seiner Hand ihr Gesicht stützte, damit sie den heiligen Leib nicht zu Boden fallen lasse, riet ein Diakon, daß der Bischof (*pontifex*) den Kelch des Heiles an ihre Kehle legen solle. Als dies geschehen war und der Teufel sofort den Ort, den er besetzt hielt, auf Befehl des Erlösers hin verlassen hatte, rief das Mädchen unter Lobpreis des Erlösers laut aus, daß sie das heilige Brot, das sie im Mund trug, hinuntergeschluckt habe. [. . .]"

Soweit der Bericht des Quodvultdeus. Es gilt nun, die Rolle und Bedeutung der einzelnen an diesem Ereignis beteiligten Würdenträger näher zu beleuchten:

a) Klar dürfte zunächst die Rolle des *praepositus* sein: er ist der Abt des Frauenklosters, der die Besessene aufnimmt und zur vereinbarten Zeit vor den Altar führt.

b) Mehrmals ist von einem *sacerdos* die Rede: er ist Vertrauens- und Bezugsperson, also direkter Ansprechpartner für die Eltern der Erkrankten. Er

trifft auch die Entscheidung, das Mädchen in ein Frauenkloster zu sperren und begleitet am Tag der wundersamen Heilung Quodvultdeus zur Messe (*ascendentibus nobis cum sacerdote*), bei der er auch konzelebriert. Er teilt dem Mädchen die Kommunion aus und will durch eine stützende Handbewegung vermeiden, daß der Leib Christi zu Boden fällt. Es ist ganz offensichtlich, daß Quodvultdeus diese im Dunkel der Anonymität bleibende Figur als die handelnde Hauptperson hinstellen will.

c) Als Ideengeber dient ein der Meßfeier beiwohnender *diaconus*: von ihm geht der entscheidende, die eigentliche Heilung bewirkende Ratschlag aus, dem Mädchen den Kelch an den Hals zu legen. Er zerstört nach der wunderbaren Heilung die Venusstatue.

d) Ganz im Hintergrund bleibt die Gestalt des *pontifex*, obwohl er der Thaumaturg ist. Erst durch die von ihm ausgeführte Handlung verläßt der Teufel das Mädchen.

Was liegt näher als den *pontifex* in Quodvultdeus selbst zu suchen, der ja gemeinsam mit dem *sacerdos* zum Kloster hinaufsteigt? Welch besseres Beispiel ließe sich für den in der Persönlichkeit des Quodvultdeus so tief verwurzelten Charakterzug der Bescheidenheit[13] finden, als diese bewußte Gewichtung und Positionierung der beteiligten Personen? Obwohl er selbst in seiner Funktion als Bischof die Besessene heilte, unternimmt er in der schriftlichen Darlegung dieser Wunderheilung alles, um seine Person hintanzustellen und andere (den *sacerdos* und *diaconus*) als Wirkende auftreten zu lassen. Eigens betont er in der Erzählung, daß der Teufel die Kranke auf Befehl Gottes hin verlassen hat (*salvatoris imperio reliquit*), er versteht sich also selbst lediglich als begnadetes Medium. Auch den Zeitpunkt des Geschehens hebt der Erzähler in besonderer Weise hervor, wenn er erwähnt, daß

[13] Diese Bescheidenheit dokumentiert Braun (1964), 108, Amn. 3, wo er manche Belegstelle für diese sympathische Geisteshaltung anführt: prol. [1], lin. 5-6 inter ceteros dominicos canes ipse catellus. Prom. 1, prol. 2 [12], lin. 31-35 Verum ne longum prooemium huius libri humanus sterilisque sensus extendat, quem in tres partes et dimidiam distributum, iuvante illo cuius munere loquimur, divina testimonia collecta undique coniunctaque supplebunt. Prom. 1,7,11 [19], lin. 20-21 . . . quantum divinitus iutus fuero. Prom. 1,21,28 [36], lin. 5-6 breviter, ut iutus fuero, explicare contendam. u.a. Die tiefe Demut des Kirchenmannes spiegelt sich ebenso im Schlußabschnitt des *Liber* wider: prom. 5,13,18 [222-223], lin. 87-105. Auch in den beiden Briefen an Augustinus begegnet er dem Bischof von Hippo mit ehrfurchtsvoller Zurückhaltung.

Diese Bescheidenheit ist gewiß auch mit ein Grund dafür, daß er kein Stück seiner literarischen Hinterlassenschaft, weder den *Liber*, noch die Predigten, noch andere vielleicht von ihm verfaßte Werke, mit seinem Namen gekennzeichnet hat.

die wunderbare Heilung an einem Sonntag erfolgte (*accidit autem ut . . . dominicus inlucesceret dies*).

Da nun der zu Beginn der Erzählung erwähnte Aspar im Jahre 434 Konsul war,[14] müssen wir den Beginn des Episkopats des Quodvultdeus zumindest in dieses Jahr zurückverlegen.

Nun ist dieselbe Stelle aber auch anders ausgelegt worden:[15]

R. Braun[16] meint, daß Quodvultdeus als Diakon oder Priester der karthagischen Kirche seinen Bischof zum Frauenkloster begleitete (*ascendentibus nobis cum sacerdote*). Der französische Gelehrte bestreitet, daß die Titel *pontifex* und *sacerdos* zwei verschiedene Personen bezeichnen, räumt aber gleichzeitig ein, daß die Figur des *sacerdos* in der Erzählung eine entscheidende Rolle spielt. Um nicht allzu oft das Wort *sacerdos* wiederholen zu müssen, habe der Verfasser in der Erzählung ein einziges Mal auf das Synonym *pontifex* zurückgegriffen.[17] Da also der *sacerdos* mit dem *pontifex* identisch sei, wäre er gleichzeitig auch der Wunderheiler. Wir teilen Brauns Ansicht, daß der Thaumaturg nur der damalige Bischof von Karthago gewesen sein

---

[14] O. Seeck, Art. Flavius Ardabur Aspar: *PW* 2,1 (1895), 607. J.R. Martindale, *The prosopography of the later Roman Empire II. A.D. 395-527*, Cambridge 1980, 166.

[15] Mit dem Schwerpunkt auf den archäologischen Gegebenheiten rund um das Ereignis interpretiert die Stelle: G. Picard, Vénus et la possédée de Carthage: *Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France*. Séance du 5 mars, Paris 1986, 59-70. Wohl richtig deutet Picard die Besessenheit als einen Fall von Anorexie. Sofern er aber den *pontifex* mit Capreolus, den *diaconus* mit Quodvultdeus gleichsetzt, kann ich seiner Auslegung nicht zustimmen. Im übrigen wäre eine tiefenpsychologische Auslegung des Abschnitts von größtem Interesse.

[16] Sources Chrétiennes 101 (1964), 91-94.

[17] Braun scheint die Ansicht zu vertreten, daß die Verwendung der kirchlichen Titel *sacerdos* und *pontifex* im *Liber* beliebig sei. Er verweist auf eine Stelle, in der Quodvultdeus einen Bischof nur mit dem Titel *sacerdos* bezeichnet: prom. 3,38,41 [183-184], lin. 34-44: der heidnische Patrizier Eutropius findet beim *sacerdos* Johannes Chrysostomus, damals schon Patriarch von Konstantinopel, politisches Asyl. Braun führt einen weiteren Passus an, in dem der karthagische Bischof Aurelius *pater multorum sacerdotum* genannt ist (prom. 3,38,44 [185], lin. 87-89). Wenn hier der Bischof als Vater vieler Priester bezeichnet wird, bleibt die für kirchliches Denken so wichtige Ämterhierarchie doch eindeutig gewahrt, ja sie wird sogar durch die Titulierung des Bischofs als *pater* besonders betont. Als weitere Begründung für seine Beweisführung verweist *Braun* (93, Anm. 1) auf gewisse nordafrikanische Inschriften, in denen Bischöfe auch als *sacerdotes* bezeichnet werden [K. Künstle, Die altchristlichen Inschriften Afrikas: *Theologische Quartalschrift* 67, 1885, 58-99; v.a. 84-87]. Dieses Argument trägt insofern nicht, als in diesen Fällen lediglich die mit dem Bischofsamt immer verbundene Funktion des Priesteramtes betont ist. Aus der Tatsache, daß ein Bischof auch in seiner Autgabe als Priester erwähnt ist, wird man nicht grundsätzlich eine Austauschbarkeit der Begriffe ableiten dürfen.

kann, können aber der Identifikation mit Quodvultdeus' Vorgänger Capreolus nicht beipflichten.[18] Warum hätte der sonst bei der Erwähnung bedeutender Persönlichkeiten mit Komplimenten nie geizende[19] Quodvultdeus gerade seinen unmittelbaren Vorgesetzten derart in den Hintergrund treten lassen wollen?[20] Der Gedanke an eine bewußte Brüskierung seines Vorgängers scheint gänzlich unwahrscheinlich.

Nun hat diese Überlegungen bereits im Jahre 1914 der belgische Gelehrte Prosper Schepens in modifizierter Form vorgetragen.[21] Trotz von anderer

---

[18] Eine gewisse Verlegenheit mit dieser Deutung muß sich Braun (93/94) indirekt selbst eingestehen: "Qui occupait le siège épiscopal de Carthage en 434? Nous sommes sur ce point dans l'incertitude la plus totale."

[19] Prom. 2,25,54 [123], lin. 85-86: venerandae memoriae Augustini episcopi. Prom. 2,34,74 [140], lin. 39-40: vir eruditissimus Orosius historiographus posuit. Prom. 2,35,79 [144], lin. 54: Labore ingenioque magno beatae memoriae Hieronymus. Prom. 2,36,82 [147], lin. 17-18: ut ait beatae memoriae Augustinus episcopus. Prom. 3,34,35 [179], lin. 25-26 beatae memoriae Augustinus. Prom. 3,38,40 [183], lin. 28-29: Symmachus ille mirabili eloquio et scientia praeditus, tamen paganus. Prom. 3,38,40 [183], lin. 41-42: per venerabilem sacerdotem Iohannem. Prom. 3,38,44 [185], lin. 87-89: sacerdotum multorum pater et dignae memoriae nominandus antistes Aurelius, caelestis iam patriae civis. Prom. 4,6,12 [198], lin. 82-83: venerabilis et apostolico honore nominandus papa Leo. Prom. 4,6,12 [198], lin. 88-89: venerabilis Nostriani episcopi.

[20] Auch Braun (94) weiß auf diese Frage keine befriedigende Antwort: "Ce serait lui [sc. Capreolus] alors qu'il faudrait reconnaître dans l'évêque thaumaturge du *Liber*, sans pouvoir d'ailleurs comprendre les raisons pour lesquelles le récit de notre écrivain a condamné ce personnage à l'anonymat."

[21] P. Schepens, Un traité à restituer à Quodvultdeus, évêque de Carthage au V^{e} siècle: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 10, 1919, 230-243 (geschrieben im August 1914). Schepens (235) weist anhand mehrerer Textstellen überzeugend nach, daß die Begriffe *sacerdos* und *pontifex* im 5. Jh. terminologisch nicht beliebig verwendbar waren. Verwirrung gestiftet haben dürfte teilweise vor allem der von Augustinus ausgesprochene Gedanke eines allgemeinen Priestertums (civ. 20,10). Grundsätzlich bezeichnete *sacerdos* den über dem *presbyter* stehenden Priester, *pontifex* als Synonym für *episcopus* den Bischof [mißverständlich dazu Braun (1964), 93, Anm. 1]. Schepens (239) stellt weiters die kritische Frage, wie der Verfasser des *Liber* beim Lesepublikum die Kenntnis der genauen Abfolge der karthagischen Bischöfe voraussetzen konnte, um den Thaumaturgen richtig zu identifizieren. Da das Ereignis dieser wundersamen Heilung in Afrika weithin bekannt war (*quod illic accidit quis illius patriae civis ignorat?*), bestand kaum Grund, den Wunderheiler bewußt zu verschweigen. Zu weit geht Schepens (240) allerdings in seiner Argumentation, wenn er Aussagen des Erzählers, die ihre ganz spezifische Bedeutung im Textzusammenhang haben, mit der Bescheidenheit des Quodvultdeus in Verbindung bringen will. So meint Schepens, daß Quodvultdeus auch durch die besondere Betonung des rein gewohnheitsmäßig erfolgten Aufstiegs zum Kloster und der dabei fast zufällig erfolgten Vorführung der Besessenen von seiner Wunderheilung ablenken will. Diese Überlegung

Seite geäußerter Bedenken[22] hielt er in einem späteren Beitrag an seiner Meinung fest.[23] Auch der niederländische Forscher Desiderius Franses, der in seiner Münchener Dissertationsschrift noch das Jahr 437 als Datum für den Beginn des Episkopats des Quodvultdeus angibt,[24] übernimmt in einem zwei Jahre später geschriebenen Beitrag[25] die Meinung von Schepens.[26]

Nach diesen Ausführungen dürfte feststehen, daß Quodvultdeus im Jahre 434 sicherlich schon Bischof war. Da das Todesjahr seines Vorgängers Capreolus, der 431 noch am Leben war, unbekannt ist,[27] kommen für den Amtsantritt des Quodvultdeus nur mehr die Jahre 432 oder 433 in Frage.

Wenn wir nun davon ausgehen können, daß Quodvultdeus 432/433 in Karthago das Bischofsamt angetreten hat, wird man die wiederholt geäußerte Vermutung,[28] daß dieser Quodvultdeus mit dem *frater Quodvultdeus noster coepiscopus* gleichzusetzen sei, an den Augustinus 429 (oder kurz vorher)

---

scheint mir zu scharfsinnig, da der Satzteil *ut matutinum illic sacrificium solito offeretur* zunächst nur auf das im Frauenkloster an Sonntagen regelmäßig gefeierte Meßopfer verweist.

[22] A. Vaccari, *Biblica* 2, 1921, 101-102 "il dotto fiammingo [sc. Schepens] fonda la sua attribuzione a Quodvultdeus su di un argumento ben fragile." Vaccari kritisiert damit nur die Zuordnung des *Liber*, nicht aber Schepens Beweisführung zur Identifikation des Thaumaturgen.

[23] P. Schepens, Les œuvres de saint Quodvultdeus: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 13, 1923, 76-78: "L'année 434, date de la délivrance miraculeuse de la possédée, ne doit pas être révoquée en doute. L'auteur du Liber l'indique lui-même très exactement en plaçant le fait sous le consulat d'Aspar, lequel d'après la chronologie coïncide avec l'année 434." Diesen Beitrag von Schepens rezensierte B. Capelle, *Revue Bénédictine* 36, 1924 [100-101] = *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine* I, 1921/28, [100-101].

[24] D. Franses, *Die Werke des hl. Quodvultdeus, Bischofs von Karthago, gestorben um 453*, Diss. München 1920, Ndr. Aalen 1970 (= Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München 4,9), 18 und 78.

[25] D. Franses, Een nieuwe kerkvader. (Sint Quodvultdeus van Carthago.): De Katholiek 162, 1922, 93-104, 98 "Het jaar 437 wordt door sommige auteurs wel van elkaar overgenomen als begin van zijn episcopaat, maar dat is willekeurig. Van zijn voorganger Capreolus weten we alleen, dat deze nog *eenigen tijd* geleefd heeft ná het Concilie van Ephese van 431."

[26] Gehör gefunden hat Schepens mit seinen Überlegungen auch bei A.D. Nock, Two notes. 1. The *Asclepius* and Quodvultdeus: *Vigiliae Christianae* 3, 1949, 49/50, Anm. 5 "Further, the story has the phrase *ascendente nobiscum sacerdote ut matutinum illic sacrificium solito offerretur*? Now at this time the bishop would certainly be the celebrant of the Sunday Mass; *nobiscum* is, I think, fatal to the theory that the writer was the *pontifex*." Dazu mißverständlich Braun (1964), 92, Anm. 3.

[27] Dem karthagischen Kalender (PL 13, 1222A: ... Kal. Ag. depositio sancti Capreoli episcopi) kann man nicht mehr entnehmen, als daß der Bischof zwischen 22. und 30. Juli verstorben ist.

[28] P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*, Paris ^{3}1964, 126/7,

einen (heute verlorenen) Brief richtete,[29] in dem der Bischof von Hippo seinem Amtskollegen Weisungen über das richtige Verhalten des Klerus in der schwierigen Zeit der vandalischen Bedrohung erteilt, wohl endgültig aufgeben müssen. Augustinus schreibt Ep. 228 im Jahre 429 an seinen Bischofskollegen (*coepiscopus*) Honoratus von Thiaua. Da er auch Quodvultdeus *coepiscopus*[30] nennt, und der uns als Prediger und Autor des *Liber* bekannte Namensgefährte 429 nicht Bischof gewesen sein kann, sind die beiden auch nicht identisch.[31]

Im weiteren halte ich jede Spekulation über das Todesdatum des Quodvultdeus für unangebracht. Wenn die Quellen auch berichten, daß im Jahre 454 in Karthago erneut ein Bischof eingesetzt wurde,[32] dürfen wir daraus,

---

Anm. 7. Denselben Gedanken äußert vorsichtiger A. Isola, Temi di impegno civile nell'omiletica africana di età vandalica: *Vetera Christianorum* 22, 1985, 273-289, v.a. 289.

[29] Aug. ep. 228,1 (CSEL 57, Hg. A. Goldbacher, Wien/Leipzig 1911, Ndr. New York/London 1961, 484).

[30] Nur ganz selten hat *coepiscopus* die Bedeutung "Hilfsbischof," gewöhnlich verwendet die Anrede ein Bischof, wenn er einen Amtskollegen anspricht. Vgl. Lambertz, Art. coepiscopus, *ThLL.* 3, 1432/3. Im übrigen scheint es in dieser Zeit das Amt des Weihbischofs als feste Einrichtung noch nicht gegeben zu haben, zumal sich ab dem 2. Jh. der Monespikopat gegenüber dem Prinzip der Kollegialität durchsetzt. Vgl. dazu E. Dassmann, *Ämter und Dienste in den frühchristlichen Gemeinden*, Bonn 1994 (= Hereditas Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte 8), 49-73.—Zieht man die Möglichkeit in Betracht, daß Quodvultdeus, der spätere Bischof von Karthago, im Jahre 429 Hilfsbischof von Capreolus war, wird man die Frage beantworten müssen, warum Augustinus in ep. 228 zuerst seinen Standeskollegen Honoratus mit *coepiscopus* und kurz danach einen Hilfsbischof mit genau demselben Titel anspricht. Dieser Schwierigkeit scheint sich Courcelle bewußt zu sein, sodaß er die Bezeichnung *coepiscopo* als Schreibfehler verdächtigt ("mais ce mot risque d'être une faute de scribe") und dafür *condiaconus* einsetzt. Der starke Eingriff in den Text ist aber durch nichts zu rechtfertigen. Außerdem mißbraucht Courcelle eine Textstelle bei Possidius, Vita Augustini 8,4 [A.A.R. Bastiaensen (Hg.) Vita di Agostino: C. Mohrmann (Hg.), *Vite dei Santi* 3, Milano ³1989, 148/151; 363/367], wenn er damit beweisen will, daß Quodvultdeus 429 Hilfsbischof von Capreolus war und Ernennungen zum Hilfsbischof als "pratique usuelle en Afrique" bezeichnet. In der Stelle bei Possidius geht es vielmehr um die Frage, ob der Presbyter Augustinus in Anbetracht der Tatsache, daß sein Vorgänger Valerius noch am Leben war, zum Bischof geweiht hätte werden dürfen.

[31] So schon Courtois (1954) a.O. 61, Anm. 305 "Quodvultdeus ne pouvait être évêque de Carthage du vivant d'Augustin et, s'il était déjà évêque, il est à peu près impossible d'imaginer qu'il ait pu être transféré de son siège inconnu à celui de Carthage." Courtois (1955) a.O. 163, Anm. 1 "la chose est absolument impossible . . . ce Quodvultdeus n'a rien de commun avec le futur évêque de Carthage." Die beiden trennt auch Mandouze a.O. 952, Quodvultdeus 14 und Bastiaensen a.O. 438.

[32] Vic. Vit. 1,24 [11], lin. 19-21: Post haec factum est supplicante Valentiniano

wie es bisher leider allzu oft geschehen ist, nicht den Schluß ziehen, daß Quodvultdeus in der Zwischenzeit verstorben ist.[33] Dies läßt sich ebensowenig beweisen wie die auch mögliche Hypothese, daß der nach Neapel verbannte Bischof aus Gesundheits- oder Altersgründen nicht wieder auf seinen Bischofsstuhl in Karthago zurückkehren konnte oder wollte.

A-5020 *Salzburg*, Kapuzinerberg 6

Augusto, Carthaginiensi ecclesiae post longum silentium desolationis episcopum ordinari nomine Deogratias.

[33] Auch in dieser Fragestellung hat man der vorsichtigen Haltung von Schepens (1919), 242 "Nous ignorons l'année exacte de la mort du saint évêque . . . nous nous abstiendrons prudemment de rapporter la mort de Quodvultdeus à l'année 454" viel zu wenig Beachtung geschenkt.

NOTE CRITIQUE SUR LE CODEX PARISINUS GRAEC. B.N. 1555 A. LA PSEUDO-HISTOIRE ECCLÉSIASTIQUE DE BASILE DE CÉSARÉE ET LES *QUAESTIONES* ATTRIBUÉES À GRÉGOIRE DE NAZIANZE

PAR

BERNARD POUDERON

Le codex *Parisinus Graecus* B.N. 1555 A est un codex de papier de 10 + 194 folios, écrit en minuscule mêlées de quelques onciales sur deux colonnes de 29 lignes; il est généralement daté des XIII^{e}-XIV^{e} siècles. Il a été décrit par H. Omont dans son *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale*, t. 2, Paris, 1888, pp. 93-94; sa description peut être complétée par celle de G. Hansen dans son édition de Théodore le Lecteur: *Theodoros Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin, 1971, pp. XXV-XXVI.[1]

Son contenu, très hétérogène, est soigneusement décrit par H. Omont; nous ne reviendrons pas sur son relevé. Mais, au sein de cette collection disparate, quelques feuillets ont attiré notre attention. En effet, du folio 167^{v} au folio 178^{v}, on trouve les fragments ou l'épitomè d'une "Histoire ecclésiastique" attribuée à saint Basile.

codex Parisinus gr. BN 1555 A

fol. 167^{v}, 1re colonne:
l. 2-3 (à l'encre rouge) titre: τοῦ ἐν ἁγ(ίου) πρς (= πατρὸς) καὶ μ (μάρτυρος ?) βασιλ΄ (-είου) ἱστορία ἐκκλησιαστική
l. 4 sq. (à l'encre noire) incipit: τί ἐστιν ἐκκλησία· ἐκκλησία ἐστὶν ναὸς θεοῦ· τέμενος ἅγιον· οἶκος προσευχῆς· συνάθροισις λαοῦ· σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ὄνομα θεοῦ· νύμφη Χριστοῦ· ἐκκαλουμένη πρὸς μετάνοιαν καὶ προσευχὴν τοὺς λαοὺς κ.τ.λ.
[= Omont, p. 93: *S. Basilii historia ecclesiastica* (167v)]

[1] J'ai pu étudier longuement ce manuscrit à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

fol. 178^{v}, 1re colonne:
l. 26-27 (à l'encre noire) desinit: . . . φησίν· οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξομολόγη/σις ἡ μετάνοια.
l. 28-29 (à l'encre rouge, très effacée) titre d'un nouvel ouvrage: ἐπιτομὴ ὅρων (= ὅρων) τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων/καθολικῆς παραδόσεως.
2ie col., l. 1 (à l'encre noire) incipit: Ἰωάννης εἶπεν· ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶν . . .
[= Omont, p. 93: *Mandata SS. apostolorum* (178v)]

Bien entendu, je me suis interrogé pour savoir de quel Basile il s'agissait, et surtout de quelle *Histoire ecclésiastique*. Une rapide enquête a fourni la solution. Il s'agit en fait d'une œuvre inédite attribuée à Grégoire de Nazianze, répertoriée dans la *Clavis patrum graecorum* de M. Geerard, t. 2, Turnhout, 1983, p. 203, sous le n° 3078:
Quaestio s. Basilii et responsio Gregorii Theologi
incipit: τί ἐστιν ἐκκλησία; ἐκκλησία ἐστὶν ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.

La *Clavis* mentionne deux codex contenant cette *Quaestio et responsio*, d'après l'étude de F. Lehherz, *Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz. Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten*, Bonn, 1958, p. 81, notes 1 et 2, dont nous avons soigneusement vérifiée l'exactitude pour ce qui nous intéresse ici, c'est-à-dire les titres et les incipit:

— *cod. Laurentianus graec.* 56, 13, s. XV, fol. 19^{r}-21^{v}:

incipit: fol. 19^{r}, l. 5-7: τί ἐστιν ἐκκλησία· ἐκκλησία ἐστὶν ναὸς θεοῦ·/τέμενος ἅγιον· οἶκος προσευχῆς· συνάθροισις λαοῦ· σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ὄνομα θεοῦ·/νύμφη Χριστοῦ· ἐκκαλουμένη πρὸς μετάνοιαν καὶ προσευχὴν τοὺς λαούς κ.τ.λ.[2]
titre (ajouté en marge, à l'encre rouge, apparemment de la même main):
l. 5: ἐρωτ(ήσεις) ἀποκρίσεις πε(ρ)ὶ ἐκ(κ)λησίας τοῦ θε(ο)λ(ό)γου[3]

[2] Voir aussi le catalogue d'A.M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum graecorum bibliothecae Laurentianae*, t. 2, Florence, 1768, pp. 309-310, cod. 56, 13, texte n° 12, p. (= fol.) 19: *Quaestiones quaedam de rebus ecclesiasticis una cum suis responsionibus. Tituli quaestionum sunt.* J'ai collationé partiellement ce manuscrit d'après des tirages fournis par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (section grecque).

[3] J'ai collationé partiellement ce manuscrit d'après des tirages fournis par l'IRHT. Mais, comme les reproductions étaient peu lisibles en cet endroit du texte, l'encre rouge en étant fort effacée, une lecture a été faite sur place à ma demande par le Dr. Franca Arduini, directeur de la *Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*, et le Dr. M.C. Vicario, à qui j'adresse mes plus vifs remerciements.

— *cod. Vaticanus Ottobonianus graec.* 441, s. XV, fol. 437b^{v}-439^{r}.[4]

titre: fol. 437b^{v}, l. 23-24: ἐρω(τήσεις) τοῦ ἁγ(ιου)/Βασιλείου και ἀποκρισ(εις) τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγ(ο)ρ(ίου) τοῦ/θεολόγου
incipit (*quaestio*): fol. 438a^{r}, l. 1: διὰ τί ἐκκλησία καὶ διὰ τί βῆμα κ.τ.λ.
incipit (*responsio*): fol. 438a^{r}, l. 4-6: ἀπόκρισις· ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία ἐ/στὶν οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ· τὸ βῆμα ἐστὶν τὸ μνῆμα/τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.[5]

Même si les textes divergent, il s'agit bien de trois recensions différentes d'une même œuvre. La version contenue dans le *Parisinus* semble très proche de celle du *Laurentianus*; en revanche, la recension du *Vaticanus* s'apparente à une ré-élaboration du texte originel, qui devait être fort long, comme en témoigne la version—plus ancienne—contenue dans le *Parisinus*.

L'origine de la confusion s'aperçoit fort bien: un scribe (peut-être celui du *Parisinus*, mais ce n'est pas sûr) a confondu l'auteur des *quaestiones* (à savoir Basile de Césarée) avec celui des *responsiones* (à savoir son ami Grégoire). Quant à comprendre pourquoi ce scribe a transformé une série de questions et réponses en une "histoire ecclésiastique," c'est une autre affaire; peut-être lui-même—ou l'un de ses prédécesseurs—a-t-il eu sous les yeux ou en mémoire l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* de Basile de Cilicie, dont nous avons ailleurs[6] cherché à retrouver les fragments à la fin de la recension de l'Épitomè byzantin d'histoires ecclésiastiques propre au *Parisinus* 1555 A (fol. 7^{r} à 23^{v}).

F-37100 *Tours*, 17 rue Trianon

[4] Les folios 437 et 438 apparaissent deux fois (437 a et b; 438 a et b). Et c'est par erreur que la *Clavis* mentionne les folios 237-239.

[5] Voir aussi le catalogue d'E. Feron et F. Battaglini, *Codices manuscripti graeci Ottoboniani bibiothecae Vaticanae*, Rome, 1893, p. 246.

[6] Voir notre article à paraître: "À la recherche de fragments de Basile de Cilicie. Le codex *Parisinus graecus* 1555 et sa recension de l'Èpitomè d'histoires ecclésiastiques."

REVIEWS

Tertullien, *Le voile des vierges* (*De virginibus velandis*). Introduction et commentaire par Eva Schulz-Flügel, adoptés par Paul Mattei, texte critique par Eva Schulz-Flügel, traduction par Paul Mattei (Sources Chrétiennes 424). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997. 288 p., 183 F, ISBN 2.-204.-05761-4.

Cette édition du traité *De virginibus velandis* est basée sur une thèse de Göttingen soutenue par Mme Schulz-Flügel en 1977. M. Mattei a adapté, parfois remanié cette thèse et il l' a traduite en français (en fait il a transformé la phraséologie allemande d'une traduction littéraliste de Mm A. Gibon-Schimke au style français [cf. p. 7]).

Il va de soi que l'introduction garde les traces de la thèse initiale. On y discute dans le détail tous les problèmes, que soulève le texte de Tertullien. Qui sont ces vierges? Quand doivent-elles se voiler? Quelles sont les idées de Tertullien sur la femme? A quelle époque de sa vie a-t-il écrit ce traité? Quel était son objectif?

En ce qui concerne le but du *De virginibus* on aboutit aux conclusions suivantes: 1. Le *De virginibus*, comme le morceau correspondant du *De oratione*, traite de la *discipline* à observer pendant la liturgie. Faudrait-il l'intituler *De virginibus in ecclesia velandis?* 2. L'opuscule sert à défendre le Montanisme contre les griefs d'hérésie (le traité doit avoir été écrit après 213, pendant la periode montaniste). 3. Le point central est constitué par la situation des femmes vouées à l'ascétisme au sein de la communauté, femmes auxquelles on refuse tout privilège (p. 36).

Quant à la tradition du texte il est remarquable de voir combien les éditions de Beatus Rhenanus, spécialement sa troisième (Bâle 1539) ont été d'une grande importance pour la constitution du texte (cf. p. 105). On retrouve cette édition, avec résumé (*argumentum*) et notes (*annotationes*) dans l'édition de Mesnart (Paris 1545), qui présente 22 traités de Tertullien, *quae primum diligentia B. Rhenani in lucem edita sunt* (entre autres le *De virginibus*) et onze traités *qui nunc primum eduntur in lucem.* Cette édition est mentionnée en passant à la p. 107. La traduction française est d'une exactitude et d'une clarté admirable. On connaît le latin rocailleux de Tertullien. Le traducteur a surmonté les difficultés d'une façon remarquable. Le commentaire

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

aide beaucoup à comprendre ce texte souvent assez difficile. On a affaire ici à une édition vraiment excellente.

Le livre contient seulement une imperfection, que je ne mentionnerais pas, si elle n'était pas vraiment étrange. A partir du ch. 4 les nombres affectant les lignes dans le marge sont fautifs en ce sens que le nombre 5 a été placé devant la quatrième ligne, le nombre 10 devant le neuvième, etc. Et cela se répète jusqu'au dernier chapitre! Dans l'apparat la numérotation est par contre correcte et donc en désaccord avec les nombres écrits dans les marges. Un caprice de l'ordinateur? C'est vraiment très curieux.

2312 9D *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Jacqueline Amat, *Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité* suivi des *Actes*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, commentaire et Index (Sources Chrétiennes, 417), Les Editions du Cerf. Paris 1996. 318 pp. 293 FF.

Dans ce volume 417 des Sources Chrétiennes ont été rassemblés tant le texte latin original de la *Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité* avec la traduction grecque que les *Actes* plus tardifs, conservés dans deux versions latines assez différentes. Les textes sont accompagnés d'une traduction française précise et assez littérale. J. Amat s'en tient à l'opinion aujourd'hui généralement admise que la priorité revient au texte latin et que le texte grec est une traduction. Ce dernier, transmis dans le seul ms. *H* (*Codex Hierosolymitanus* 1), remonte à un archétype latin différent de *A* (*Codex Casinensis* 204 MM), qui est le seul manuscrit à présenter une réelle originalité. Les autres manuscrits de même que le manuscrit grec paraissent remonter plutôt à un autre archétype commun.

Le texte présenté ne s'écarte guère de celui de l'édition de C. van Beek (1936) qui fait autorité pour les éditions modernes. La *Passion* proprement dite est suivie des *Actes* qui, sous une forme longue et brève, ont été transmis par de nombreux manuscrits, preuve de leur grande diffusion. C'est à Van Beek que nous devons la première édition critique du texte I des *Actes* ainsi que la toute première édition du texte II. Traitant avec soin le problème de la relation entre ces deux textes, J. Amat—contrairement à Van Beek—arrive à la conclusion que le texte II est un abrégé du texte I. Vu les traits hagiographiques, la forme de l'interrogatoire et les modifications de l'optique du récit, les deux textes ne sauraient guère être antérieurs au V^e^ siècle. A bon droit l'auteur relève les différences notables entre le texte latin et le texte grec de la *Passion*: tandis que le premier est d'un

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

style familier, la version grecque est plus littéraire. Dans la présente édition certaines formes vulgaires ont été maintenues (p. ex. 13,8 *expertus sum*: "je me réveillai"; Van Beek: *experrectus sum*).

Amat accepte la date traditionnelle du martyre (203, sous le règne de Septime-Sévère). Que le martyre ait eu lieu le 7 mars paraît suffisamment confirmé par les cérémonies anniversaires du *dies natalis*. On est d'ailleurs d'accord pour rejeter la date du martyre telle qu'elle apparaît dans les *Actes* et dans le manuscrit grec de la *Passion* (pendant la persécution des empereurs Valérien et Gallien, au milieu du troisième siècle).

Dans l'Introduction l'auteur fait des remarques judicieuses sur les principaux aspects et sur des questions générales dont on constate qu'elles ont été traitées en détail comme elles le demandent. La traduction a été faite avec beaucoup de prudence. Dans le commentaire excellent et dense figure parfois une discussion sur les nuances possibles du texte. Cela n'empêche pas qu'on puisse différer d'opinion sur quelques détails. C'est ainsi qu'on pourrait admettre que les rosiers du paradis (*arbores rosae, Passio* 11,5) et les *arbores* dans 11,6 sont identiques. Dans une vision des rosiers d'une hauteur immense sont à leur place. La tournure bien connue *sedens pro tribunali* figure dans quelques passages (p. ex. *Actes* I 1,2 *Minutius proconsul sedens pro tribunali*: "Le proconsul Minutius, siégeant du haut du tribunal"). Il semble préférable également de combiner *sedens* avec *pro tribunali* dans *Actes* I 4,1 *et sedens pro tribunali eos exhiberi praecepit* (Amat: (Minutius arriva) "pour siéger et donna l'ordre de les faire comparaître devant le tribunal"; mais *exhiberi* est employé plutôt absolument ici). De même *Actes* II 4,1; comparez aussi l'emploi de *ante* dans d'autres tournures avec *tribunal*: *Actes* I 6,1 *stantem ante proconsulis tribunal* et *Actes* II 6,1 *Venientes . . . ante proconsulis tribunal.* Dans *Passio* 21,1 on lira *de toto* (au lieu de *de tota*) *corde.* Dans *Passio* 16,3 γενεθλίοις n'a pas été traduit. Amat: "à nous qui sommes destinés à périr sous le nom de condamnés de César." Je voudrais proposer: "à nous, de nobles condamnés, destinés à périr à l'anniversaire de César." Enfin: *Passio* 19,5 μεθ' ἡμέραν τῶν φιλοτιμιῶν (Amat: "après le jour des jeux"); plutôt: "un jour après les jeux" (comp. le texte latin correspondant *post dies muneris*: "quelques jours après les jeux").

Avec l'édition de J. Amat nous disposons d'une édition nouvelle soignée et commentée (après celles de Van Beek, Musurillo et Bastiaensen) de la *Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité* ainsi que des *Actes.*

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

Paul Boulhol, *Anagnorismos. La scène de reconnaissance dans l'hagiographie antique et médiévale* (Publications de l'Université de Provence). Aix en Provence, 1996. 260 pp. 170,— FF.

La scène de reconnaissance (*anagnorisis* ou *anagnorismos*) est un motif littéraire qui dans l'Antiquité se rencontre pour la première fois dans l'*Odyssée*, puis notamment dans la tragédie et la comédie postérieure. Enfin, à l'époque impériale, elle est devenue un élément stéréotypé du genre romanesque. Boulhol a fait des recherches sur le développement de ce motif dans l'hagiographie, domaine négligé jusqu'ici. Il peut faire état d'une série de parallèles, mais en même temps il constate un certain nombre de différences avec le traitement de cette scène dans les romans de l'Antiquité. Il s'agit d'une douzaine de Vies et Passions, entre autres les *Recognitiones Clementinae* et les *Vitae* et *Passiones* d'Eugénie, Eustache (Eustathe), Hilaire, Jean le Calybite et Xénophon.

Dans plusieurs cas la scène de reconnaissance, motif d'origine profane, est modifiée et adaptée dans les textes chrétiens. C'est ainsi que, dans la *Vita et Passio sancti Eustathii*, une vision divine annonce d'avance qu'Eustache aura à subir des épreuves graves; il sera un Job chrétien s'il en triomphe. A l'opposé de ce que nous voyons dans les romans antiques, le héros ne se met pas en quête de son épouse durant sa longue retraite de quinze ans. Il remet totalement son destin à la Providence; ses tribulations sont admises par Dieu. C'est le mérite de l'auteur d'avoir bien mis en évidence que, dans les récits chrétiens, la scène de reconnaissance ne sert pas de conclusion à l'histoire, puisque l'hagiographe veut montrer que l'ancienne relation est surmontée. "Le héros revoit, retrouve ses parents: mais le but de son voyage n'est pas là. On a quitté le monde du roman." (p. 98) Le récit peut se poursuivre, et le terme de la route, c'est tantôt le martyre, tantôt le couronnement d'une vie ascétique: l'union avec Dieu.

Un thème sans équivalent dans le roman grec est le guide qui aide parfois le héros à fuir sa famille. C'est ainsi qu'une vieille femme procure à Apollinaire des habits de moine et qu'un gardien d'église l'accompagne à Saint-Ménas. Que dans la *Vie de Jean* un évangéliaire doré serve de signe de reconnaissance, peut être rangé parmi les éléments christianisés, de même que les passages bibliques qui jouent parfois un rôle dans la scène d'*anagnorismos*: *Genèse* 45,3-15 (Joseph et ses frères); *Luc* 15,20-21 (l'enfant prodigue et son père). Puis le lieu des retrouvailles peut cadrer avec la couleur chrétienne du récit. Dans la *Vie de Xénophon*, par exemple, Arcadius et Jean se rencontrent dans l'*Anastasis* de Jérusalem. Autre aspect spécifique-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

ment chrétien: dans quelques cas l'*anagnorismos* est suivi d'une seconde et définitive séparation, un départ soit pour le martyre, soit pour l'ascèse monastique. "Ici la hiérarchie des valeurs chrétiennes entre en jeu. L'ancienne relation familiale, malgré son importance, est surmontée." (p. 88)

Sans prétendre à procéder à une investigation systématique l'auteur relève enfin le succès du thème dans l'hagiographie médiévale, fait qui se reflète tant dans le grand nombre de manuscrits et des traductions que dans la création de nouvelles oeuvres analogues. Une petite remarque: dans les titres des études allemandes il n'est pas rare de constater des fautes.

La valeur de l'étude de Boulhol, un aperçu clair et systématique des matériaux en question reposant sur une connaissance approfondie des sources et de la littérature secondaire, consiste surtout dans les remarques judicieuses sur l'influence éventuelle du roman profane sur l'hagiographie et dans les recherches précises sur les caractéristiques spécifiquement chrétiennes de la scène de reconnaissance dans les textes chrétiens.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. Bartelink

Thomas Graumann, *Christus interpres. Die Einheit von Auslegung und Verkündigung in der Lukaserklärung des Ambrosius von Mailand*, Patristische Texte und Studien Band 41, Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1994. XI, 477 S.

Graumann's is a voice in a modern academic chorus that is convinced that the traditional image of Ambrose as a moral preacher and practical man of the Church who had a merely limited notion of theology is wrong. The work under review is meant as a contribution to the little researched field of Ambrose's exegesis, since the extant studies are mostly concerned with Ambrose's works on the Old Testament and his use of certain sources. Its focus is the relationship between hermeneutics and theology in Ambrose's commentary on Luke, the only substantial explanation among his works of a New Testament textual unity. The question asked is about the theological centrality of the Christ event in this explanation. The commentary on Luke is not a homily or an actual commentary, but an exposition, i.e. a narration about and around the text. A good deal of the work contains translations or adaptations of older Greek authors. Book I and II quote Origen, book III and X Eusebius of Caesarea. Hilary's Commentary on Matthew is also used and the rest is supposedly based mainly on Ambrose's own homilies.

In the prooemium the author discusses the style and subject matter of

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

the treatise, and compares the approaches of the four evangelists. Matthew is presented as concerned with ethics (symbol: a man), Mark with ratio (symbol: a lion), John with (meta-)physics (symbol: an eagle) and Luke with history (symbol: a calf). The four approaches have one common concern: to explain the Christ event. Thus the four symbols show four aspects of Christ: the true man, who is the strongest (the lion), the sacrifice (the calf) and the resurrection (the eagle). The title of the book expresses the author's central concern: to show Ambrose's exegesis as based on a correct, non-heretical, christology. *Scripturae verus interpres Christus* (VII,50). Christ, understood in an orthodox/catholic way as the Word of God reduces the heretics to speechlessness and gives voice to Scripture and its proclamation.

A number of points ought to be made. The author stresses against Jerome, that Ambrose did not really copy Origen, but adapted his text in so many ways, that there can be no question of plagiarism. This matter is taken up again in the Summary at the end of the book. Graumann follows Sieben in assuming that Ambrose only knew "a similar collection" to Jerome's collection of Origen's 39 homilies dealing mainly with Luke 1-4 and that Jerome's translation of Origen is basically reliable (p. 48). But a fresh consideration of the matter would have been in place. Even if we may confidently assume that Jerome did not make polemical alterations or abbreviations in Origen's work (may we indeed?), we can still look for other traces of Origen's homilies in Ambrose's work by comparing it with the surviving Greek fragments. If we find any such traces, it means that Ambrose had more than "a similar collection" to Jerome's, that the picture of Ambrose's quotations is incomplete and thus that the matter of his originality needs to be reconsidered. A random search on the basis of the surviving Greek fragments from Origen's homilies on Luke resulted in the discovery that Ambrose's work contains at least one near quotation from Origen not found in Jerome. It is from the explanation of Luke 8:41-56, Rauer's fragment 125 (p. 279), i.e. fragment 63, p. 448 line 17 in the new *Fontes Christiani* edition: ἐὰν ἴδωμεν τὴν πίστιν ἡμῶν τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ νοήσωμεν, πηλίκος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίνος ἠψάμεθα αὐτοῦ, ὀψόμεθα, ὅτι πρὸς σύγκρισιν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ κρασπέδων κρασπέδου ἠψάμεθα. Ambrose's Latin reads (VI,58, SC 45, p. 249): *Nunc si consideremus quanta sit fides nostra et intellegamus quantus sit dei filius, uidemus quia conparatione eius fimbriam tantummodo tangimus, superiorem uero uestimenti eius partem nequimus adtingere.* This clearly proves that Ambrose disposed of either the Greek original or a more extensive translation of Origen's homilies on Luke than a similar collection to Jerome's collection would contain, and used it too.

Another matter is that in advocating the centrality of the Christ event in the commentary on Luke, the author anachronistically uses Chalcedonian two natures language, something which Ambrose himself never does. As far as I can see, the word *natura* is only used for the divine nature; the human nature is indicated in different ways such as *caro, homo* etc. Therefore the expression *distinctio naturarum* (p. 257) is out of context and we may wonder what precisely is meant when this distinction is declared to be the decisive dogmatic presupposition of Ambrose's exegesis (pp. 277, 338). Indeed we would like to know more precisely how this "Grundunterscheidung zweier Naturen" (p. 293) is found in Ambrose and can be traced back to Athanasius (pp. 430, 435).

The value of the book lies in its detailed analysis of parts of this much-neglected work of Ambrose. The central thesis, that Christ understood in an orthodox way holds the key to the correct understanding and proclamation of Scripture, is the conviction of a preacher who values sound theology as the basis of his proclamation. Our criticisms concern the question of the sources and the question of the appropriateness of fifth century christological language in this fourth century context, but do not affect the work's standing as a worth while and thorough study of the commentary on Luke.

1217 LB *Hilversum*, Burg. Lambooylaan 19 M.F.G. PARMENTIER

Theodore Silverstein and Anthony Hilhorst (eds.), *Apocalypse of Paul. A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme XXI), Genève: Cramer, 1997; 216 pp., 54 plates.

In this volume, the texts of seven Latin manuscripts of the *Apocalypse of Paul* are edited. These manuscripts represent three versions of the long Latin text, which, via one or more translations, go back to a Greek text (or several Greek texts). Two main versions are distinguished. (a) On pp. 66-162, *Visio Pauli* 1-44 is printed in four parallel columns; on pp. 164-167, the text of one manuscript's chapters 45-51 follow. (b) Three manuscripts represent a second version, containing *Visio Pauli* 3-6 and 10-51. They are printed in parallel columns on pp. 170-207. The text of a Middle German fragment of chapters 23-25 is added, mainly as an additional witness to the second version (pp. 210-212).

In the first chapter of the introduction, pp. 11-21, the editors describe the history of the Western (= Latin) tradition. Not everything is sufficiently

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

clear: for instance how they view the relationship of the Greek text as published by Tischendorf (*G*) to the Latin tradition. In the Preface, J.K. Elliott is criticized for having described *G* as "only a summary of the original" (p. 9); however, on p. 11, they characterize *G* as a "considerably abbreviated exemplar," but also as representing the ancient source "with great fullness." A text-critical and literary-historical comparison of the long Latin versions with *G* is therefore painfully lacking.

Even more serious is the absence of proof for the editors' other critical claims. They distinguish the manuscript tradition of the long Latin version in three groups: L^1, represented by two manuscripts: Paris (*P*) and St Gall (*St G*), as well as a large fragment: Escorial (*Esc*); L^2, represented by three manuscripts: Zürich (*Z*), Graz (*Gz*), and Vienna (*F*); and L^3, represented by one manuscript, Arnhem (*Arnh*).

Within L^1, mss *P* and *St G* are said to "vary from one another in some details and such fashion as to indicate that each is independent of the other, yet their general likeness in language and doctrine indicates that they belong to the same version, L^1" (pp. 10-11); nothing more is said about the relationship between these two manuscripts. *Esc* is classed as belonging to this part of the tradition without further comment. Only the relationship of *Arnh* (here published for the first time) to L^1 is discussed at some length (pp. 13-18).

It is argued that *Arnh* basically offers the text of L^1, but that the scribe had another source at his disposal, especially for §§ 14-18. The nature of this source is, again, not very clear. On p. 16, a remarkable reading of *Arnh* is cited, which strongly suggests that the scribe copied a manuscript with alternative renderings *in margine*. On p. 13, another example leads to the conclusion that *P* and *Arnh* offer, in that instance, "separate renderings of the same Greek source." On the other hand, when on p. 15 *P*'s reading *quos scismate* (a corruption of *quo scemate*, which translates ποίῳ σχήματι) is discussed, *Arnh*'s rendering *quomodo* (a perfect rendering of the Greek expression) is not said to be a reflection of another translation, but an incorrect emendation by the scribe. In the following examples, the editors appear to suggest that *Arnh*'s *Vorlage* was a different Greek text.

The final conclusion on p. 16 is rather vague: "the Arnhem manuscript appears to be a scribal copy of a Long text drawing in considerable part on L^1 but interwoven also with many passages independently rendered from a variant Greek original." If I understand the editors well, they mean that *Arnh* basically offers the text of L^1, but has incorporated marginal readings that its *Vorlage* had adopted from another Greek text and/or an alterna-

tive translation. Because of that, they call it L^3; I would have preferred to see it designated as L^1, with readings reflecting another version, L^3.

Since the editors have not investigated the relationships between the four representatives of $L^{1/3}$ more closely, they are not able to provide a critical or even eclectic text. They claim that they have not intended to reconstruct the original texts, because the manuscripts are far too divergent for that (p. 59). To be sure, if the texts of all manuscripts were identical, an archetype can be quickly reconstructed (and that might have been done in the case of L^2, of which the manuscripts seem to be extremely similar).

My point is not that I think it *can* be done in the case of L^1, but that I would wish to have been informed by the editors why it *cannot* be done. This edition presents the raw material of the manuscripts only (and not even that, as I shall presently point out), with text-critical relationships only claimed, not substantiated. The volume's sub-title, "A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions," is therefore not justifiable.

Of course, there may be some use in an edition of manuscripts' texts: such editions provide information about scribal habits and about the state and development of the Latin language in the Middle Ages in different parts of Europe (p. 7, and see the fine codicological and palaeographical descriptions of the manuscripts, with linguistic notes added, on pp. 23-39). Moreover, they provide the material in a convenient way, so that critics can use it for further investigation of the textual history. However, the editors say that they did not want to simply present diplomatic editions of the manuscripts.

In the chapter on editorial practices (pp. 59-64), the authors observe that they aimed at presenting the manuscripts' texts only, but "stripped of those, and only those corruptions that make them incomprehensible." On the other hand, obvious corruptions that still make sense, are left unaltered: "we have put ourselves in the place of the original readers of the manuscripts, who had to make sense of the scribes' writing without external information." This in itself is inconsistent: if we are to act as if we were the original readers, we should have the incomprehensible readings just as the original readers had them; suggestions for mending the text should then appear in the apparatus. Moreover, the reason for correcting a scribe is not that a corruption results in incomprehensibility, but that the text is evidently corrupt.

The editors themselves give an excellent example on p. 59. *Arnh* § 41 contains the following words: *gemuit cum Maria*, whereas the correct reading

(given by *P* and *St G*) is obviously *genuit eum Maria.* Nonetheless, the editors retain the reading of *Arnh.* To be sure, *Arnh* is comprehensible, but it still is nonsense, and should have been corrected. Neither are the editors consistent in practice. In the same sentence, it is said that in some pit the souls of certain people are tortured, namely of *quicumque non confessus fuerit* that Christ has appeared in the flesh—the reading is that of *P* and *St G*, but the *non* is added to *Arnh* by the editors (p. 155b). It is obvious that the omission of *non* in *Arnh* is erroneous: without *non* the text is nonsensical, even if there is nothing incomprehensible in the statement that the confessors of Christ will be tortured.

In another instance (*P* § 9, line 14), the editors leave the manuscript's *ins spelunca* (*ins* at the end of the line, as is scrupulously recorded in the apparatus), the most innocent of scribal errors, but retained with excessive respect for the particularly illiterate copyist of *P* (the first hand of this manuscript wrote *h* wherever he saw an opportunity; a better informed corrector sharpened his knife and duly erased them all; the editors, however, respectfully restored them where traces of the erased *h* were visible, so that we are treated to a feast of *homnibus, hocciderit, hoccurrunt* and *hunusquisque* in *P* § 7 alone—all spelled correctly in the text of *Arnh*; for some unclear reason, the editors decided not to restore the *himago dei* in line 15).

This respect for the manuscripts is absent in much more incisive matters that are far more instructive with regard to the characteristics of the manuscripts' texts. For instance: in § 23, *Arnh* reads *a noto eius flumen lactis et exspelioco flumen uini*, which is nonsense; the editors in the main text offer the elegant conjecture *a noto eius flumen lactis et ex apeliote flumen uini.* This *ex apeliote* ("on the Eastern side") is also useful in § 22, where it can emend four different corrupt readings: *loco illo aec uidi* (*P*); *et aperuit ostium* (*St G*); *tem exapilato* (*Esc*); *in ampliori loco* (*Arnh*). I prefer the editors' emendation to the readings of *P, St G* and *Arnh* (the scribe of *Esc* does not seem to have gone through much trouble to make sense of his text); but if scribes are to be respected, should these efforts of theirs not be retained in the text, rather than *ins spelunca* or *hunusquisque*? In this case, however, the editors have adorned all texts with the beautiful *ex apeliote.*

So the editors follow an ambiguous course. On the one hand, they do not want to interfere in the manuscripts' texts, on the other, they are prepared to save the scribes from their most glaring errors; the decision as to what is still acceptable or not apparently depends on the editors' discretion. I would say that, given the editors' choice to present the manuscripts' texts, either *all* suggestions for emendation should have been relegated to

the apparatus, or *all* evident errors should have been corrected, with the scribal *curiosa* recorded in the apparatus.

Rich bibliographies precede the texts in the introduction. The volume is concluded by 54 splendid photographs: a specimen of all manuscripts edited here, and photographs of manuscript *P* in its entirety. Regrettably, there is no index of words.

Leiden University, Faculty of Theology J. TROMP

James C. VanderKam and William Adler (edd.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Assen, Van Gorcum-Minneapolis, Fortress 1996) xii + 286 pp.

This volume consists of five chapters, each written by a competent scholar, and illuminates various aspects of the transition of Jewish apocalyptic into the Christian church: it makes clear which apocalyptic writings crossed over to Christianity, what happened to them in their new setting, how they were understood, and perhaps foremost: which Christians were interested in apocalypses or apocalypticism and why. I shall briefly sketch the subjects of the various chapters, with only marginal criticisms.

In chapter one ("Introduction," pp. 1-31) W. Adler introduces the essays in the following chapters, but also gives a penetrating account of past research on Jewish and Christian apocalyptic, urging for serious recognition of the fact that practically all that we know of Jewish apocalyptic stems from Christian settings.

In chapter two ("1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature," pp. 33-101) J.C. VanderKam discusses first the status of Enochic literature in early Christianity. The earliest Christian authors who quote from the Enochic books nearly all accord scriptural authority to them. Some are interested mostly in 1 Enoch's views on the final judgment, the majority, however, in its story of the fallen angels. The book's authority had waned by ca. 300 C.E. In the second section, V. studies the early Christian uses of the story of the fallen angels. This subject is rightly distinguished from that of the first section, although obviously some overlap exists. Finally, in the third section, the figure of Enoch in early Christian literature is discussed. A good deal of this section is devoted to the identification of the witnesses in Rev. 11:1-2 as Enoch and Elijah.

The three subjects treated in this chapter are connected by the name Enoch only. In the first section on 1 Enoch, the question whether the five

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

booklets incorporated in the Ethiopic Enoch already existed as a unity from the first century onwards, is deliberately left undecided. Also, V. is unwilling to take a stand in the debate about the date of 1 En. 37-71. As a result, he reserves his opinion in a number of cases: it is left to the reader to conclude that, as far as certain quotations are concerned, only 1 En. 1-36 and 72-108 are attested. On the other hand, I find that V. concludes too much in his second section, namely when he assumes that 1 Enoch was probably the source for the myth of the fallen angels in other writings. He clearly demonstrates that this story was widespread in the early church, but also that 1 Enoch is rarely quoted in this connection (apart from the quotations discussed in section 1). The possibility, then, that many authors knew the story (including its association with the figure *and* the book of Enoch) from oral tradition, independent of any literary source, is not sufficiently examined.

In chapter three ("Christian Influence on the Transmission History of 4, 5, and 6 Ezra," pp. 102-127), Th. A. Bergren presents 4-6 Ezra as an *exemplum* of the transmission and editing of many pseudepigrapha in a Christian context. After briefly pointing at two possible instances of Christian influence in the Greek hyparchetype of all versions, the author discusses each version in turn to conclude that, with the exception of the Armenian version, the extent of identifiable christianization is limited, involving only minor textual alterations. In the history of the Latin tradition, however, obvious christianization is visible in the combination of 6 Ezra with 4 Ezra (which must have taken place before the 5th century) to form a single book, which developed into the "French" and the "Spanish" branches, and the subsequent accretion (in the mid-5th century) of separate branches of 5 Ezra.

B. concludes his contribution by pointing at other pseudepigrapha (such as the *AscIsa* and the *HistRech*) which may be originally Jewish, but underwent similar processes of Christian editorial supplementation of initial and/or final sections. This suggestion that one should generalize the conclusions of B.'s essay is unfortunate. Every case should be studied in its own right; the case for the Christian origin of the *AscIsa* as a whole is particularly strong; whereas the case for a Jewish kernel of the *HistRech* is extremely weak.

D. Frankfurter's chapter four ("The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories," pp. 129-200) discusses the legacy of Jewish apocalypses in early Christianity. The important question is asked

which Christians continued the apocalyptic heritage from Judaism. Within this apocalyptic heritage F. lucidly distinguishes between people who were themselves prophets (therefore "actively" carrying on the business of receiving apocalypses) and were little concerned with the existing literary specimina of apocalypticism, and people who were not interested in actual prophecy, but in the surviving apocalyptic books as ancient sources of divine knowledge. In both cases, the early Christian interest in prophecy or apocalyptic books must be seen as continuous with the Jewish interest, that is, one should not phrase the Jewish apocalyptic heritage in Christianity in terms of "adopting" (ideas, writings), but rather in terms of "continuing" in the various apocalyptic frames of mind. The circles who read (and wrote) apocalypses as ancient sources of divine knowledge could be Jewish or Christian, or even neither (especially in the widespread Egyptian speculative apocalypticism of the "Gnostic" kind). Similarly, the phenomenon of inspired speech, whether by eschatological prophets or revered hermits, existed in Judaism and was continued by Christians. The transition of apocalypticism from Judaism to Christianity is therefore first of all a matter of ideological development within groups of comparable sociological definition.

I find F.'s essay (which extends far into the Byzantine period and is rich in detail) enlightening and convincing. One point, however: I would question F.'s assessment of one major literary difference between Jewish apocalypses and Gnostic revelatory texts. He states that "Jewish apocalypses were consciously written as extensions and unveilings of biblical traditions," whereas the "Gnostic texts focus upon the revelatory scene itself, reducing the frame narrative to the minimum" (pp. 155-156). But the frame narrative in such Jewish apocalypses as 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra would hardly seem more important than in Gnostic texts, nor are these Jewish apocalypses better characterized as extensions and unveilings of biblical traditions than their Gnostic counterparts.

The last chapter by W. Adler ("The Apocalyptic Survey of History Adapted by Christians: Daniel's Prophecy of 70 Weeks," pp. 201-238) offers an example of the varied ways in which an apocalyptic text could be understood, both by Jews and Christians. These ways include for instance: reapplication of the seventy weeks to new historical circumstances and changed expectations of the future; and historicizing interpretations, claiming that the Danielic prophecies had been largely fulfilled, thereby trying to deprive it of its eschatological potential. The same end was pursued by postponing the last week to an indeterminate time in the future. A further

traditional branch of exegesis, remarkable for its tenacity over against the dominant christological interpretation, connected Dan. 9:25 with the murder of Hyrcanus II by Herod.

The interesting thing about A.'s description of the history of this exegetical issue, is the contrast between the view of the esoterics who considered apocalyptic literature as a source for divine knowledge or even eschatological speculation on the one hand (the most obvious context for the transition of the Jewish apocalyptic tradition into Christianity; see Frankfurter's chapter), and on the other hand the efforts of the eventually prevailing ecclesiastical tradition, who had to deal with Daniel as an authoritative and therefore all the more inconvenient writing.

The volume is handsomely produced. It contains a bibliography and full indexes (of sources, subjects, and modern authors).

Leiden University, Faculty of Theology J. TROMP

Walter Burkert, *Klassisches Altertum und antikes Christentum. Probleme einer übergreifenden Religionswissenschaft* (Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen. Heft 1). Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1996. XI + 52 pp.

In 1995 Jena University instituted the custom of an annual lecture in honour of one of its most renowned scholars. Nowadays interdisciplinary research has become fashionable and unfortunately too much is travelling under its colours. What it really means is shown in the career of Hans Lietzmann (1875-1942) and in that of the first orator of the series. Anyone familiar with the work of Walter Burkert will acknowledge his admirable expertise in a wide range of disciplines and his ability to marshal the various accomplishments of these disciplines in order to understand ancient Greek religion. In a short introductory laudatio, Prof. C. Markschies singles out Burkert's interest in "dem funktionellen Zusammenhang zwischen erzählendem Mythos und den rituellen Kulthandlungen" (5) as the prime motive of his research. At the time *Creation of the Sacred. Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Harvard U.P., 1996) had not yet appeared. Perhaps this title words the centre of his interest more clearly.

In any case, the organizers at Jena could not have wished for a better opening of their series of Lietzmann-lectures. In a mere 34 pages the orator provides an impressive succinct survey of what has been going on in both Altertumswissenschaft and religious studies in the past century, interpreting the developments in the light of the cultural and social history of

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

the same period. For although scholars are forever strenuously trying to withdraw from the pressure of contemporary society and politics, a brief look at the history of their craft shows how their predecessors' theories and themes were tied up with the society in which they lived and worked.

The author seems a little severe on present-day classical philology (in the widest sense of the term), which he finds less inclined to widen its horizon by employing new methods than theology. A far from negligible part of those in the profession gladly benefits from valuable new insights, not only in the domain of linguistics and literary criticism, but surely also in the fields in which Burkert himself has been operating so successfully. Moreover, the exhortation which he addresses to theologians and philologists "die Welt der Spätantike mit ihren Varianten und Konflikten, mit ihren Konstanten und Übergängen gemeinsam zu erforschen" (44) has already been taken to heart by many of those who are engaged in patristic studies. Burkert's critical remarks, however, have nothing in common with morose faultfinding. On the contrary, his words testify to the hope that by paying serious attention to the great problems mankind has to cope with, "die historische, altertumswissenschaftliche Forschung bei diesem allgemeinen Lernprozess mithelfen kann" (46).

Universiteit Utrecht J. DEN BOEFT
Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Roelof van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* (Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies XXXIX). Leiden-New York-Köln, E.J. Brill, 1996. IX and 300 p. NLG 188.50/US$ 111.–.

The appearance of this collection of articles marks the retirement of Prof. Roel van den Broek as Professor of the History of Christianity at the University of Utrecht in 1996. The fifteen studies on Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity which it contains demonstrate the wide variety of themes within this rich field that Van den Broek has mastered. Most of the studies have been published previously, though not always in easily accessible places—a legitimate reason to republish them. Four articles (nos. 1, 6, 10 and 15) appear here for the first time. Of these four, number 1 focuses on Gnosticism and Hermetism as two different ways to salvation, describing their points of contact and, even more, their points of divergence. Study 6 deals with the final hymn of the *Apocryphon of John*, in which Van den Broek brings out elements drawn from Jewish wisdom literature.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

The two preceding articles both dating to 1981 also deal with the *AJ*, one (number 4) on the mythological structure of the work, and another (number 5) on the demiurge, the creation of man, and the influence of Plato's *Timaeus*. Article 10 ventures beyond the world of Antiquity and poses the question of how and why medieval Cathars can be considered "Gnostics" in spite of the absence of certain "gnostic" prerogatives, such as a clear mythological interest or a strong emphasis on "gnosis" as saving knowledge (the debate over what should be considered "gnostic" and whether the word should be used at all, is, of course, ongoing; see the recent study of Michael Allen Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism." An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, Princeton 1996). Van den Broek proposes two tenets as essential features of gnosticism (p. 176): that the material world has been made by an evil creator and that the soul has been emprisoned in the body. By this standard the Cathars fit the "gnostic" picture adequately (cf. also p. 7, where a full account of the problem of definition is given). The last unpublished article, number 15, falls into the section on Alexandrian Christianity and places the *Teachings of Silvanus* within Greek gnomic traditions; the author compares the Teachings with biblical sapiential writings and with other wisdom traditions, such as the *Sentences of Sextus*. Preceding this is an older article (number 14) that also deals with Silvanus' theology. In it van den Broek argues for a relatively late date for the *TS* (the beginning of the fourth century) on the basis of its language, which echoes the Christological controversies of that period.

Although written during a span of over twenty years and covering a broad spectrum of subjects, ranging through Bogomile, Cathar and Iranian writings, the articles show a remarkable consistency in terms of both interest and approach. As stated by the author, the Nag Hammadi codices, whose discovery gave such a strong incentive to the study of Gnosticism and so greatly enhanced our knowledge of mythological and theological speculation, should be interpreted within the religious and philosophical context of the Graeco-Roman world. Judaism and Christianity should not be isolated or treated as outlaws but considered integral parts of contemporary religious traditions (p. VII).

Guided by this principle and keeping in sight the broad lines of the argument—as opposed to "hypercritical scholarship" that impedes rather than helps knowledge (p. 172)—Van den Broek worked through a great variety of difficult materials; he thereby opened new venues of comparison and interpretation. In addition to the variety of sources, the author shows that an equally rich variety of religious groups and beliefs promul-

gated them. He teaches his readers that variety was the hallmark of early Christianity, not only in the first centuries but far beyond. Thus he brings into the spotlight works of philosophical, pseudo-philosophical, pseudepigraphical, Hermetic, "Gnostic," and Manichean signature that have been unfamiliar far too long. There is, for example, a compelling study (number 9) on a Coptic fragment long considered part of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, which van den Broek deconstructs as stemming from the sixth century. In his opinion, the fragment has no connection with the *GH* but originated in an environment hostile to docetic views of the virgin Mary that were apparently widespread in early Byzantine times—views that went as far as worshipping Mary as a goddess; through very uncertain channels, these beliefs even seem to have influenced Bogomiles and Cathars centuries later.

Van den Broek's technique of comparing religious/mythological writings with more philosophically oriented texts has proved to be very fruitful. In article thirteen, the *Authentikos Logos* (Codex VI/3 of the Nag Hammadi papyri) is juxtaposed with Platonic elements from writers such as Numenius, Porphyry and Macrobius. This is an approach which not many scholars can handle, limited as we all are by the stigma of being specialists in one particular field but not in another. Van den Broek has convincingly shown that these artificial boundaries can be transgressed. His analyses and comparisons are always accompanied by an impressive coating of bibliography, revealing both the author's pedagogical qualities and his extensive erudition. A profound knowledge of the relevant ancient languages—in particular, Coptic—lies below the surface.

Some questions of methodology remain hanging in the air; most urgent are those connected with the problem of dating. Stressing a tendency in recent Nag Hammadi studies to date many of the writings later than previously thought, the author declares (p. VIII) that he was one of the first to date the *Teachings of Silvanus* to the early fourth century. This might be true but only after he had changed his mind considerably on this point, since he argued in an earlier stage of his career for a second-century date. The article, written in Dutch and not included in this volume, was on non-gnostic Christian traditions before Clement and Origen, and the argument had been centered on Silvanus' description of the divine soul in relationship to its human appearance (see "Niet-Gnostisch Christendom in Alexandrië voor Clemens en Origenes," *NTT* [33] 1979, pp. 287-299, part. 291). The author considered it "unthinkable" that the way the *TS* discussed the issues of μορφή and οὐσία would appear at a later date—after

Clement that is. I think that this line of reasoning was legitimate, and more arguments could be brought in to support it. At many points the *TS* is closely comparable to aspects of the works of Clement of Alexandria; it is as if one reads a more domesticated and tame Clement. Origen, however, marks a turning point for many of the issues, and his wide influence has been felt ever since.

My point is not that opinions on dates should not change (an inevitable occurrence for anyone who takes scholarship seriously) but that an objective and balanced method should be established to make one's case. It is not enough to select some items and compare them to earlier or later sources to prove a date. The author has used this method twice and has come out two centuries apart. Either the date is early and layers of later redactions have been added, weaving in theological concerns of a later period, or else the date is late but for some reason or other the source has used much antiquated material. The question remains what criteria should prevail in a comprehensive assessment. Problems of dating (and origin) shadow his argumentation in connection with not only the *Teachings of Silvanus* but also other sources, such as the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Letter of Eugnostus* the Blessed (see pp. 23, 52, 75, 79, 87, 121-122, 192).

These few question marks do not alter the significance of Van den Broek's prolonged and productive work for making the religious world of Late Antiquity more accessible. We congratulate him on this result and hold him to his promise that, freed from the burdensome duties of academia, his σχολή will lead to new fascinating studies.

23 Common Street, *Dedham*,
MA 02026, USA

ANNEWIES VAN DEN HOEK

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bienert, Wolfgang A., *Dogmengeschichte* (Grundkurs Theologie Band 5,1). Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1997. 240 pp. ISBN 3-17-010810-7. Price DM 29.80.

Blowers, Paul M. (ed.), *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity* (The Bible through the Ages 1). Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997. 468 pp. ISBN 0-268-00701-2 (hb). Price $60 (hb), $40 (pb).

Borgonovo, Graziano (ed.), *Gesù Cristo, Legge vivente e personale della Santa Chiesa: Atti del IX Colloquio Internazionale di Teologia di Lugano sul Primo capitolo dell'Enciclica Veritatis splendor Lugano, 15-17 giugno 1995.* Casale Monferrato: Edizioni Piemme, 1996. 304 pages. ISBN 88-384-2574-4. Price Lire 35,000.

Bureau, Bruno, *Lettre et sens mystique dans l'Historia Apostolica d'Arator* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes: Série Antiquité 153). Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997 (diffusion Brepols). 547 pages. ISBN 2-85121-166-8.

Burkert, Walter, *Klassisches Altertum und antikes Christentum: Probleme einer übergreifenden Religionswissenschaft* (Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen 1). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996. xi + 52 pages. ISBN 3-11-015543-5. Price DM 28.

Cocchini, Francesca (ed.), *Il dono e la sua ombra: ricerche sul* Περὶ εὐχῆς *di Origene. Atti del I Convegno del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su "Origene e la Tradizione Alessandrina"* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 57). Roma: Istitutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1997. 195 pp. ISBN 88-7961-040-6.

Dolbeau, François (ed.), *Augustin d'Hippone: Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes: Série Antiquité 147). Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1996 (diffusion Brepols). 756 pages. ISBN 2-85121-152-8.

Dominik, William J. (ed.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature.* London and New York: Routledge, 1997. 268 pp. ISBN 0-415-12545-6. Price £14.99 (pb).

Dulaey, Martine (ed.), *Victorin de Poetovio, Sur l'Apocalypse et autres écrits* (Sources Chrétiennes 423). Paris: Les éditions du CERF, 1997. 243 pp. ISBN 2-204-05738-X. Price FFr 154.

Frede, Hermann Josef, and Stanjek, Herbert (edd.), *Sedulii Scotti collectaneum in apostolum: II. In epistolas ad Corinthios usque ad Hebraeos* (Vetus Latina Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 32). Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1996. ISBN 3-451-21953-0.

Freyburger, Gérard, and Pernot, Laurent (edd.), *Du héros païen au saint chrétien: Actes du colloque organisé par le Centre d'Analyse des Rhétoriques Religieuses de l'Antiquité (C.A.R.R.A.), Strasbourg 1-2 décembre 1995* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes: Série Antiquité 154). Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997 (diffusion Brepols). 231 pages. ISBN 2-85121-159-5. Price BFr 950.

Gryson, Roger (ed.), *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; 12 (Pars II) Esaias, fascicule 10 Is 61,10-65,23.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1997. pp. 1521-1600. ISBN 3-451-00130-6.

Keller, Adalbert, *Translationes Patristicae Graecae et Latinae: Bibliographie der Übersetzungen altchristlicher Quellen. Erster Teil: A-H.* Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1997. xxxii + 454 pp. ISBN 3-7772-9729-1. Price DM 440.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Martyn, J. Louis, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997. xvii + 334 pages. ISBN 0-567-09698. Price £24.95.

Meijering, E.P., *Athanasius: Die dritte Rede gegen die Arianer, Teil II: Kapitel 26-58 Übersetzung und Kommentar.* Amsterdam: Verlag J.C. Gieben, 1997. 318 pages. ISBN 90-5063-367-6. Price Hfl. 98.

Moreau, Madeleine; Bochet, Isabelle, and Madec, Goulven, *Augustin La doctrine chrétienne (De doctrina christiana)* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne 11^2). Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997 (diffusion Brepols). 626 pages. ISBN 2-85121-161-7. Price BFr 1700.

Patterson, L.G., *Methodius of Olympius: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ.* Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997. 261 pp. ISBN 0-8132-0875-0. Price $59.95.

Rodrigues Pereira, A.S., *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 34). Assen: Van Gorcum, 1997. viii + 456 pp. ISBN 90-232-3260-7. Price Hfl. 120, $58.

Runia, David T., and Sterling, Gregory E. (edd.), *Wisdom and Logos: Studies in Jewish Thought in Honor of David Winston* [= *The Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997)] (Brown Judaic Series 312). Scholars Press, Atlanta 1997. xxiii + 394 pp. ISBN 0-7885-0411-8. Price $39.95.

Savvidis, Kyriakos, *Die Lehre von der Vergöttlichung des Menschen bei Maximos dem Bekenner und ihre Rezeption durch Gregor Palamas* (Münchener Universitätsschriften: Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orthodoxe Theologie 5). Erzabtei St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 1997. 233 pp. ISBN 3-88096-139-5.

Schulz-Flügel, Eva, and Mattei, Paul, *Tertullian, Le Voile des Vierges (De uirginibus uelandis)* (Sources Chrétiennes 424). Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 1997. 288 pages. ISBN 2-204-05761-4. Price 183 FFr.

Silverstein, Theodore, and Hilhorst, Anthony (edd.), *Apocalypse of Paul: A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 21). Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1997. 213 pp. and 54 plates.

Trevijano Etcheverría, Ramón, *Estudio sobre el Evangelio de Tomás* (Fuentes Patrísticas Estudios 2). Madrid: Editorial Cuidad Nueva, 1997. 451 pages. ISBN 84-89651-27-2.

Valantasis, Richard, *The Gospel of Thomas* (New Testament Readings). London and New York: Routledge, 1997. xvii + 221 pages. ISBN 0-415-11622-8 (pb). Price £40 (hb), £12.99 (pb).

Volonté, Ernesto W. (ed.), *La famiglia alle soglie del III Millenio: Atti del Congresso europeo Lugano, 21-24 settembre 1994.* Facoltà di Teologia di Lugano: 1996. 243 pages. Price SFr 38.

Vregille S.J., Bernard de, and Neyrand S.J., Louis (edd.), *Apponius Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques (livres IV-VIII)* (Sources Chrétiennes 421). Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 1997. 346 pp. ISBN 2-204-05709-6. Price FFr 250.

Wallraff, Martin, *Der Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates: Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsdarstellung, Methode und Person.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. 379 pages. ISBN 3-525-55176-2. Price DM 138.

L'ANTOINE D'ATHANASE
À PROPOS DES CHAPITRES 83-88 DE LA *VITA*

PAR

FRANÇOISE FRAZIER

Résumé: Dans la composition complexe de la *Vie d'Antoine*, les chapitres 83-88, eux-mêmes riches et complexes, occupent une place très particulière, comme suspendus entre la fin du récit de la vie et le début du récit de la mort d'Antoine. Cette étude s'efforce de montrer par une analyse détaillée comment ils fixent l'image d'Antoine voulue par Athanase, en reprenant, modulant ou amplifiant les thèmes déjà développés autour des deux grands axes de l'*arétè* et de l'*ôpheleia* du personnage. La vie d'Antoine, c'est d'abord une aventure spirituelle, qui réalise les promesses du Christ et manifeste une puissance divine sans cesse glorifiée dans le texte. Relais qui doit donner ce qu'il a reçu, Antoine est lui-même un "don" de Dieu aux hommes: ses parénèses tout au long de l'oeuvre ont déjà esquissé la figure du maître d'ascèse enseignant ce qu'il a appris des Écritures, à mille lieues des intellectuels du didascalée; il devient ici le "médecin de l'Égypte" qui rappelle aux empereurs comme aux juges la primauté du spirituel sur le temporel. Il est ainsi engagé par Athanase dans ses combats: combat de chrétien contre les forces démoniaques, combat d'évêque contre les ariens. Dans un jeu d'équilibre subtil entre l'humilité qui sied au moine, soumis à Dieu et à ses clercs, et le prestige du Saint, le patriarche d'Alexandrie transforme Antoine en prophète de l'Église annonçant la victoire des orthodoxes et exploite la scène de mort, sur le fond (les legs) comme sur la forme (c'est lui qui reprend la parole) pour renforcer son autorité hiérarchique de l'autorité morale d'Antoine.

La présente étude part du constat d'une double complexité de la *Vie d'Antoine*: complexité de l'image d'Antoine donnée par Athanase d'une part, complexité de la structure de la biographie d'autre part. Athlète de Dieu (12.1), Père des Moines (15.3; 54.6; 66.7), que les Empereurs eux-mêmes voudraient pour Père (81.1), maître de l'ascèse apprise dans les Écritures (46.6), martyr de la conscience (47.1), *idiôtès* (73.3 et 85.5) *theodidaktos* (66.2), qui, contre les ariens (69) ou face aux païens (72-80), développe les thèmes apologétiques d'Athanase, "autorité" sollicitée par tous, mais s'inclinant devant l'autorité des clercs (67.1), médecin de l'Égypte (87.3), homme de Dieu (70.2; 71.1; 93.1) caché sur la montagne, mais manifesté par Dieu (93.5-6): on n'en finirait pas d'énumérer les facettes de ce modèle chrétien,

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

qui porte si profondément l'empreinte de son biographe,[1] la marque des préoccupations de l'évêque responsable de la ferveur et de l'unité de son église, et du combattant de la foi de Nicée soucieux de s'assurer l'alliance des moines dans son combat.

Ainsi peut-on voir dans la *Vita* non seulement un "creuset de la christologie d'Athanase,"[2] mais de l'ensemble des thèmes développés dans son oeuvre, avec, à côté du cadre sotériologique dessiné par le *De incarnatione Verbi*, une catéchèse digne du *De Virginitate*,[3] des accents polémiques venus des discours *Contra Gentes* ou *Contra Arianos*, et même un engagement du moine dans la communauté au moment des périls qui n'est pas sans rappeler la lettre *Ad Dracontium*. Unifier toutes ces perspectives dans un seul récit n'allait pas de soi et l'on comprend d'emblée toute la difficulté que présentait non seulement la "construction de (ce) modèle de sainteté,"[4] mais la simple construction du récit chargé de le faire apparaître.

Cette difficulté éclate dans les analyses successives et divergentes qui en ont été données par les critiques.[5] Si en effet les étapes successives de l'anachorèse qui inscrivent dans l'espace l'approfondissement de la spiritualité sont très nettes,[6] elles sont loin de couvrir l'ensemble du texte et l'on n'a plus à partir du chapitre 54 qu'un va-et-vient entre la montagne intérieure et la montagne extérieure qui permet à Antoine de concilier recueillement personnel et direction spirituelle. On voit ainsi se dessiner deux grandes

---

[1] Il n'en était pourtant *a priori*, comme le montre M. de Durand (St. Antoine, écrivain illettré, *Connaissance des Pères* n° 64, déc. 1996, pp. 15-16) "très proche ni par l'idéal de vie chrétienne ni par les circonstances de l'existence quotidienne."

[2] Selon le titre de l'article de M.-A. Vannier, *Connaissance des Pères* n° 64, p. 17.

[3] Pour ne pas parler de l'importance de la psalmodie "rythmant" la vie intérieure du spirituel, développée dans le *Ad Marcellinum*.

[4] Selon le titre de l'article de M. Alexandre dans *Saint Antoine entre mythe et légende*, ELLUG, 1996, 63-93, qui désormais sera cité M. Alexandre (1996).

[5] G.J.M. Bartelink est bien optimiste lorsqu'il écrit dans son édition (*Sources Chrétiennes* n° 400, p. 64): "L'analyse de la structure de la VA pose moins de problèmes que celle des influences littéraires."

[6] Après la "conversion" en deux temps (2 puis 3.1), il commence son ascèse "devant sa maison," sorte de "noviciat" où il va butiner les vertus des autres ascètes (3.2-7, où apparaissent déjà des principes personnels), puis il va "dans les tombeaux à distance du village" (8-10), puis "vers la montagne," dans un fort (11-14); il en ressort prêt à assurer la direction spirituelle des autres, et après le grand discours de 16-43, part dans "le désert intérieur" en 49; d'où en 49-53 une séquence qui fait écho à—et dépasse- 1) 2-7 (comparer l'Évangile (2.3) "Si tu veux être parfait . . ." et le conseil de la voix (49.4) "Si tu veux être tranquille . . ."); 2) 8-14 (même attaque des bêtes sauvages en 9 et 52-53, avec, la seconde fois, une victoire interprétée (53.3) comme "la chute des démons").

parties,[7] l'une où prédomine l'ascèse, l'autre où, l'ascèse demeurant toujours en toile de fond,[8] s'épanouissent les charismes: c'est, en gros, la traduction littéraire de la volonté du Seigneur, qui "*à cause de leur vertu propre et de leur utilité pour autrui* manifeste et rend célèbres en tout lieu ceux qui se cachent et s'appliquent à vivre dans la retraite."[9] Dans cette optique, le "tournant" du texte semble se situer au chapitre 46, lorsque le martyre, souhaité par Antoine[10] et qui pourrait être le couronnement de son ascèse, lui est refusé par le Seigneur qui "le gardait *pour notre utilité et celle des autres.*"[11]

Faisant une large place aux relations d'Antoine avec les autres,[12] cette seconde partie joue donc un rôle essentiel dans la "diversification" de son image, en même temps qu'elle multiplie les problèmes d'interprétation. On a parfois proposé d'y voir l'application du schéma suétonien dégagé par Leo et de la considérer comme une partie consacrée à la peinture du caractère (*èthos*), après le récit des actions (*praxeis*). C'est peut-être simplifier

---

[7] G.J.M. Bartelink retient une division en deux parties 1-48/49-88 avant la séquence de mort; c'est aussi, sans spécification des limites, le découpage retenu par P. Cox (*Biography in Late Antiquity*, Univ. of California Press, 1983, p. 53), qui se réclame d'A.J. Festugière et R. Reitzenstein—lequel pourtant suggère trois parties; 1-48, qui viendrait d'une biographie de Pythagore; 49-66, issus d'une arétalogie; 67-88, fruits de l'expérience personnelle—; le Père de Voguë, dans sa présentation de la traduction de B. Lavaud (*Foi Vivante* 240, Paris, 1989), coupe 1-15/16-48/49-94; trois parties aussi pour le Père Couilleau (cité par Y. de Andia, "Antoine le Grand, *theodidaktos*," *Le monde copte* n° 21-22, p. 28, n. 20), qui, prenant l'analyse sous un angle formel, dégage une structure récit-discours, qui rappellerait celle de l'Evangile selon St. Matthieu: 1) récit (chs. 5-15)—discours (chs. 16-43); 2) récit (chs. 44-68)—discours (ch. 55); 3) récit (chs. 69-73 et 81-88—discours (chs. 74-80)—la coupure entre 68 -pureté de la foi- et 69 -condamnation des ariens- surprend—; enfin K. Holl (*N. Jahrb. f. kl. Altertum* 29, 1912, 406 sq.) allait jusqu'à cinq étapes bien marquées 1-7; 8-10; 11-47; 48-81; 82-94.

[8] Voir 66.6 et 82.2: ainsi s'inscrit dans le texte la nécessité de ne jamais se relâcher puisqu'il suffit d'un jour pour tout perdre (18.2).

[9] 94.1: διά τε τὴν αὐτῶν (= *ipsorum*) ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ὠφέλειαν.

[10] 46.2: πόθον μὲν εἶχε μαρτυρῆσαι, qui succède à ses soupirs de 45.1, lorsqu'il songe aux demeures célestes, τόν τε πόθον ἔχων εἰς αὐτάς. . . . On peut peut-être aussi suivre les progrès de l'ascèse à travers les précédentes occurrences de πόθος: περὶ τὸν τόνον τῆς ἀσκήσεως en 3.5, mesure de l'ascèse en 7.10, il devient πόθον τῶν θείων dans la grande catéchèse, en 35.5, lorsqu'apparaissent de bons esprits—et donc que l'ascète est assez avancé pour avoir des visions (ὀπτασίαι).

[11] 46.6: ἦν αὐτὸν φυλάττων εἰς τὴν ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ἑτέρων ὠφέλειαν.

[12] Il semble significatif que le ch. 50, qui raconte l'arrivée d'Antoine à la montagne intérieure, parle non seulement de l'amour dont il se prit pour cet endroit, effusion spirituelle qui marque sa proximité de Dieu, mais aussi, et tout autant, de sa sollicitude pour ses fils et ses visiteurs, pour lesquels il se met à cultiver quelques légumes.

à l'excès, même s'il est vrai qu'on trouve des "sous-titres" proches des "rubriques" de la biographie—ou des catégories de l'éloge—dans les chapitres 67 à 81,[13] qui envisagent successivement les rapports d'Antoine avec les clercs (67), les hérétiques (68-71),[14] les philosophes païens (72-80) et les empereurs (81) et enrichissent peu à peu l'image de l'ascète. Toujours d'un point de vue formel, on peut encore découper cette seconde partie en séquences thématiques: 49-53, l'ascèse à la montagne intérieure; 54-66,[15] les *thaumata*;[16] 67-81, les rapports avec le monde. Mais on ne peut les considérer comme un simple portrait *statique* de l'*èthos*: la "suite" de l'itinéraire chrétien, l'*anodos*, c'est-à-dire le mouvement vertical après la retraite "horizontale" qui ramènera Antoine "comme dans sa propre cité,"[17] est préfigurée par les visions de la séquence 54-66[18] avant de se réaliser dans le récit de la fin de la vie d'Antoine, aux chapitres 89 à 94.[19] En outre, ce découpage n'intègre pas les chapitres 82-88, dont les critiques n'ont pas trop su quoi faire. Ainsi Priessnig en faisait un appendice couvrant le "grand âge," tandis que K. Holl les regroupait avec la séquence de mort; R. Reitzenstein, de son côté, les associait à la séquence précédente et considérait le passage 67-88 comme une sous-partie entièrement centrée sur l'*èthos*, avis auquel se range aussi G.J.M. Bartelink,[20] mais sa présentation est suffisamment

---

[13] 67.1: πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἦθος ἀνεξίκακος ἦν καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ ταπεινόφρων; 68.1: καὶ τῇ πίστει δὲ πάνυ θαυμαστὸς ἦν καὶ εὐσεβής; 72.1: καὶ φρόνιμος δὲ ἦν λίαν; 81.1: ἔφθασε δὲ καὶ μέχρι βασιλέων ἡ περὶ Ἀντωνίου φήμη.

[14] Et déjà un peu les païens "de base" qu'il convertit à Alexandrie (70.2 sq.).

[15] Les limites en fait sont incertaines, car 54-55 reprennent plutôt la figure du prédicateur (55 complétant 16-43), tandis que 67, qui, aux § 1-3, entame la séquence sur les rapports avec les autres, met en relief dans les § suivants un "charisme" d'Antoine, dont le visage rayonne de sérénité.

[16] Je préfère garder le mot grec (on le trouve en 58.5; voir aussi, en 65.1, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα θαυμαστὰ τοσοῦτον ὅσον τὰ ἄλλα θαυμασιώτερα μᾶλλον φαίνεται) plutôt que de parler de "miracles," qui semblent insister encore davantage sur un pouvoir surhumain, qu'Antoine n'a pas—il récuse d'ailleurs lui-même l'admiration en 62.2, après qu'Athanase a souligné que le seul *thauma* d'Antoine était "qu'assis sur la montagne, son coeur restait vigilant alon que le Seigneur lui montrait ce qui se passait au loin."

[17] L'idée d'un retour dans sa cité propre est exprimée en 89.4, quand il est prévenu de sa fin prochaine.

[18] Ch. 60 (accueil d'Amoun par les anges); 65 (arrivée de l'âme d'Antoine); 66 (sort général des âmes).

[19] Comme Amoun, mais de façon plus discrète, Antoine mourant est accueilli par les anges (92.1: ὥσπερ φίλους ὁρῶν τοὺς ἐλθόντας ἐπ' αὐτόν).

[20] Pour tous les détails sur les analyses précédentes, on se reportera à son article, Die literarische Gattung der *Vita Antonii*. Struktur und Motive, *Vigiliae Christianae* 36, 1982, 38-62.

embarrassée pour trahir tout ce qu'a d'insatisfaisant cette analyse. Il écrit en effet:

> – 67-88: les qualités d'Antoine: l'humilité (67), la foi (68-71); la perspicacité (72-73); discussion avec les philosophes païens (74-80);[21] renommée d'Antoine (81: correspondance avec l'empereur); visions, miracles et exhortations.[22]

En quoi ce dernier groupe relève-t-il des "qualités d'Antoine"? À quels chapitres correspond-il? Aux chapitres 82-88 sans doute, mais curieusement rien n'est précisé. Or si l'on se reporte au texte, on s'aperçoit que la séquence 83-88 est comme isolée du reste par deux articulations nettes, qui correspondent aux thèmes posés dans le prologue: Athanase s'y proposait de répondre aux moines qui lui demandaient "comment il commença l'ascèse, qui il était auparavant et quel fut τοῦ βίου τὸ τέλος" (§ 2) et, pour ce faire, de leur envoyer les ὀλίγα τῶν ἐκείνου dont il se souvenait (§ 4). On retrouve ici les mêmes expressions: 83.1 est introduit par un τοιαῦτα μὲν τὰ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου, qui conclut le passage précédent et 89.1 commence le récit de la mort avec οἷον δὲ καὶ τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ τοῦ βίου γέγονεν, ἄξιον κἀμὲ μνημονεῦσαι. On a donc ainsi un chapitre 82 qui, par son contenu (la vision anti-arienne), ne semble pas se rattacher à ce qui précède, puis six chapitres, de 83 à 88, comme "suspendus" en état d'apesanteur temporelle, entre le récit de la vie et le récit de la mort d'Antoine. Qu'apportent-ils? Ils ne sauraient certes à eux seuls résumer tout le texte, mais au terme du récit, ils fixent des traits d'Antoine dont on peut penser, de ce fait, qu'ils sont essentiels aux yeux d'Athanase. Les étudier, c'est donc d'abord préciser "l'interprétation athanasienne de la figure d'Antoine."[23] Mais c'est aussi, si on les replace dans l'ensemble du mouvement final,[24] mieux voir comment insensiblement le biographe, en quelque sorte, s'approprie son personnage jusqu'au point où l'évêque et le moine finissent par ne faire plus qu'un.[25]

---

[21] La séparation de 72-73 avec 74-80 est très discutable, car dans les deux premiers chapitres déjà Antoine est face à des philosophes païens; le début de 74 marque bien la continuité: Ἀμέλει μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν ἑτέρων ἐλθόντων. . . .

[22] *Ed. cit.*, p. 65.

[23] Je reprends l'expression à M. de Durand, *art. cit.*, n. 1.

[24] Ce qui permet aussi de réintégrer dans le mouvement le chapitre 82, resté en suspens.

[25] La remarque en est faite par A. Martin, Athanase d'Alexandrie, l'Église d'Égypte et les moines: à propos de la *Vie d'Antoine*, *Revue des sciences religieuses* 71, 1997, p. 173.

La spiritualité du moine

Cette séquence elle-même, reprenant les deux grands aspects de la figure d'Antoine, *arétè* et *ôpheleia*, insiste dans un premier temps (83-85) sur la spiritualité du moine, avant de se concentrer sur ses "parénèses," qui en font le "Médecin de l'Égypte" (86-88). Il faut toutefois noter que, de ce premier passage non plus, les devoirs de charité ne sont pas absents. Il n'est que d'en regarder les limites: débutant par un rappel de la toute-puissance divine (83-84.1), il se conclut sur l'opinion des juges, qui reconnaissent en Antoine un homme "aimé de Dieu" (85.5), après ses interventions bénéfiques dans les procès. Le texte ainsi rappelle que l'homme de Dieu ne saurait négliger la charité, tandis que son mouvement même suggère la place intermédiaire du moine *entre* Dieu et les hommes, du saint "tout à Dieu"[26] et qui fait partager aux autres les bienfaits de l'amour de Dieu. Attaché donc à préciser les éléments essentiels de la spiritualité du moine,[27] le passage est nettement distingué du développement précédent: non seulement, d'un point de vue formel, il commence par une phrase à caractère conclusif (τοιαῦτα μὲν τὰ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου), mais le thème de la phrase suivante—que fait attendre le μέν—accentue encore ce caractère de "nouveau commencement." On y lit en effet: οὐ δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἀπιστεῖν, εἰ δι' ἀνθρώπου τοσαῦτα γέγονε θαύματα, c'est-à-dire un écho de l'avertissement du prologue, où Athanase dit s'être partout "soucié de la vérité, afin que, si l'on en entend davantage, on ne refuse pas d'y croire (μήτε . . . ἀπιστήσῃ) pas plus que si, à l'inverse, on a appris moins qu'il n'eût fallu, on ne conçoive du mépris pour cet homme" (Prol. 5). Ce thème traditionnel des introductions, où tout auteur, païen ou chrétien, a à asseoir sa crédibilité, se transforme chez le second en appel à la foi en Dieu, source des merveilles qui montrent Sa grandeur.[28] Athanase toutefois infléchit quelque peu le thème, puisque,

[26] J'emploie le mot "saint" bien que jamais Athanase ne qualifie Antoine de *hagios*, mais la grandeur que prend le moine dans ces derniers chapitres, les problèmes du culte des saints que suscite son enterrement me paraissent justifier le mot; sur la monotropie du moine "tout à Dieu," voir A. Guillaumont, *Aux origines du monachisme chrétien. Pour une phénoménologie du monachisme*, *SO* 30, Bellefontaine, 1979.

[27] J'emploie cette expression par commodité, même si l'on admet, avec I. Hausherr (Spiritualité monacale et unité chrétienne, article de 1958, repris *in Études de spiritualité oriental*, Rome, 1969, p. 315 sq.) qu'elle peut être source de confusion et faire perdre de vue que cette spiritualité ne diffère de celle du chrétien "ordinaire" que par une pratique *epitetamenôs*.

[28] Voir, par ex., Theodoret de Cyr, *Histoire Philothée* (Prol. 10): "Je prie donc les lecteurs . . . de ne pas refuser créance (*apistein*) à mes propos, s'ils entendaient quelque

à la puissance de Dieu, dont le saint homme n'est que l'instrument,[29] il ajoute la puissance de la foi en se référant à trois paroles du Christ,[30] ou plutôt à trois "promesses" (*epaggeliai*), ce qui accentue encore la relation de confiance et de foi établie entre Lui et les hommes. La première, qui suscitait les sarcasmes de Porphyre,[31] est tirée de l'Évangile de Matthieu (17.20): "Si vous avez la foi comme un grain de sénevé, vous direz à cette montagne: Pars d'ici et va-t-en ailleurs, et elle s'en ira ailleurs. Et rien ne vous sera impossible." Cette puissance de la foi, qui fait de l'homme un relais de la puissance divine, Antoine lui-même s'en est fait l'interprète face aux philosophes païens opposant "raisonnements démonstratifs et foi agissante,"[32] dont l'extension du christianisme est la preuve la plus éclatante.[33] Ce transfert de puissance a sa source dans l'amour de Dieu,[34] comme le suggère la citation suivante, qui introduit l'idée de don: "En vérité, en vérité, je vous le dis, si vous demandez quelque chose au Père en mon nom, il vous le donnera. Demandez et vous recevrez" (Jn. 16, 23-24). Ainsi sont rappelés les liens que le Christ et la foi au Christ nouent entre le Père et le fidèle: telle est bien la proximité à laquelle aspire le moine. Mais le chrétien ne peut rester replié sur lui-même et la troisième citation le souligne, dans la manière dont elle est introduite comme dans son contenu:

---

chose qui soit au-dessus de leurs forces, et de ne pas mesurer la vertu de ces hommes sur la leur; mais qu'ils sachent bien que Dieu a l'habitude de mesurer les charismes du Saint-Esprit sur les âmes des saints et qu'il donne les plus grands aux plus saints. Que cela soit dit pour ceux qui ne sont pas trop bien initiés aux choses de Dieu, car ceux qui sont initiés aux mystères de l'Esprit connaissent la générosité de l'Esprit, et quels miracles il accomplit dans l'homme par l'homme, afin d'attirer par la grandeur de ses prodiges les incrédules à la connaissance de Dieu."

[29] Sur l'emploi récurrent de *dia* + génitif, voir M. Alexandre (1996), p. 53.

[30] La constance des références scripturaires est un des traits saillants de la *Vita*; mais l'accumulation de trois extraits des Évangiles ici tout à la fois donne un relief particulier à ce passage et le remet pour ainsi dire entre les mains du Seigneur, source non seulement des *thaumata*, mais aussi du discours qui les explique.

[31] Sur les critiques de Porphyre, voir F. Ruggiero, *La follia dei cristiani*, "Porfirio: razionalità e irrazionalità in un secolo di crisi," 163-188, et sur la polémique d'Athanase avec lui, P.F. Beatrice, La Croix et les idoles d'après l'apologie d'Athanase "Contre les Païens," *Cristianismo y aculturacion en tiempos del Imperio Romano*, Antig. crist. (Murcia) VII, 1990, 159-177, en part.171 sq; cet articlé m'a été signale et procuré par A. Martin.

[32] 77.3: Καὶ τί πρεσβύτερόν ἐστιν, ἡ δι' ἐνεργείας πίστις ἢ ἡ διὰ λόγων ἀπόδειξις; même expression aux § 4, 5 et 6; voir aussi en 78.1: ἡμεῖς τοίνυν οἱ χριστιανοὶ οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγων Ἑλληνικῶν ἔχομεν τὸ μυστήριον, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει πίστεως ἐπιχορηγουμένης ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

[33] Καὶ ὅτι ἐνεργής ἐστιν ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν, ἰδοὺ νῦν . . . (78.2).

[34] Sur la bonté divine, voir les paroles d'Antoine, lors de la guérison d'une jeune fille

> C'est lui aussi qui dit à ses disciples et à tous ceux qui croient en lui: "Guérissez les malades, chassez les démons. Δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε" (Matth. 10.8).

Le contenu de la parole, qui fait du fidèle, et singulièrement du chrétien modèle qu'est Antoine, un successeur des apôtres,[35] insiste sur le rôle de *relais* de celui qui, ayant reçu, doit donner. Ce thème, essentiel dans la *Vie d'Antoine*, est bien mis en valeur, dans l'écriture même d'Athanase, par les récurrences des mots. Qu'on se reporte en premier lieu à la "mission" réservée par Dieu à Antoine, lorsqu'il lui refuse le martyre:

> Il avait l'air affligé, parce qu'il n'avait pas témoigné par le martyre. Mais le Seigneur le gardait pour notre *ôpheleia* et celle des autres,[36] afin d'en faire, dans l'ascèse qu'il avait apprise lui-même des Écritures, le maître d'un grand nombre (46.6).

Antoine devient ainsi l'incarnation vivante de ces Écritures, qui doivent être aux yeux d'Athanase l'unique source de la foi et de l'enseignement.[37] De fait, le biographe a bien souligné comment, dès sa jeunesse, il avait réservé son attention aux seules lectures,[38] si bien que sa mémoire était déjà toute pleine des *Actes* lorsqu'il entra à l'église et entendit les paroles du Seigneur, qu'il prit pour lui (2.4); si bien que, dès les débuts de son ascèse, il s'était pour ainsi dire incorporé les Écritures, au point d'avoir "désormais la mémoire qui lui tenait lieu de livres" (3.7). Ce sont les Écritures encore qui lui apprennent à ne pas se relâcher à sa première victoire contre le Diable (7.3); d'elles qu'il tire les références pauliniennes ou l'exemple d'Élie qui guident son ascèse et ses leçons.[39] Aussi peut-il dire lors de sa dernière visite à ses fils de la montagne extérieure: "Conservez la tradition des pères et surtout la piété et la foi en notre Seigneur Jésus-

---

de Busiris (58.5): κἀκείνη τοίνυν ὁ Κύριος ἐπένευσεν εὐξαμένῃ, κἀμοὶ δεδήλωκεν ἡ αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπία, et surtout, à nouveau, face aux philosophes: Καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον τῆς προνοίας φρονοῦμεν, ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀδύνατον ἦν τῷ θεῷ (74.8).

[35] Cette dimension apostolique est récurrente dans le texte; au moment de sa "vocation," Antoine est en train de méditer un texte des *Actes des Apôtres* (2.2); de même au cours de son séjour à Alexandrie (ch. 70), le désir qu'on a de le toucher rappelle l'épisode des linges de Paul (*Actes* 19.11-12) et les conversions provoquées par les miracles l'action de Pierre (*ibid.* 9.35 et 42); la figure de l'*idiôtès* (73.3) vient aussi des *Actes* et de la comparution de Pierre et Jean devant le Sanhédrin (4.13).

[36] Sur cette opposition entre désir personnel et service des autres, voir *Phil.* I. 20-24.

[37] Ce qu'il fait dire à Antoine au début de sa grande catéchèse (16.1) et confirmer ensuite en 26.4; je reviendrai sur ce point *infra*, à propos de la figure de l'*idiôtès*.

[38] 1.3: τοῖς ἀναγνώμασι προσέχων—le verbe même de l'ascèse; avant d'être "attentif à lui-même," Antoine commence par l'être aux Écritures.

[39] Les références sont ici innombrables; voir en particulier, dès ses premières réflexions, 7.8-13; 19.2—et *passim* dans le grand discours—; 55.4 et 6.

Christ, *que vous avez apprises des Écritures et qui vous ont souvent été rappelées par mes soins*" (89.6). Ces rappels et ces leçons forment la majeure partie de l'*ôpheleia* d'Antoine pour les autres;[40] il ne fait ainsi que leur redonner ce que lui-même, dès son jeune âge, a reçu, puisque, à l'époque, grâce à son attention aux lectures, il conservait τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὠφέλειαν (1.3): c'est ainsi qu'il est devenu pour Athanase lui-même un κέρδος ὠφέλειας (Prol. 3).[41]

Ce rôle de relais, en même temps qu'il interdit d'attribuer à l'ascète la puissance de Dieu,[42] pose le problème de la conciliation de la vie spirituelle et de la charité: ce sont les deux thèmes que développe le chapitre 84, qui, après les promesses générales du Christ, revient au cas particulier d'Antoine:

> Ce n'était donc pas en donnant des ordres qu'Antoine guérissait, mais en priant et en prononçant le nom du Christ, de sorte qu'il était manifeste pour tous que ce n'était pas lui qui agissait, mais le Seigneur qui, par l'intermédiaire d'Antoine, témoignait son amour aux hommes et guérissait les malades. Ce qui relevait d'Antoine, c'était seulement la prière et l'ascèse, pour laquelle il était assis sur la montagne, où il se réjouissait de la contemplation des choses divines, mais s'affligeait d'être importuné par beaucoup de gens et entraîné par eux vers la montagne extérieure (84.1-2).

Le rôle d'Antoine se limite donc à manifester la puissance et la bonté de Dieu: la distinction est sans cesse martelée tout au long du texte, avec une insistance qui en dit long sur le risque du culte des Saints. Athanase n'hésite pas alors à intervenir dans le texte: dès les premiers combats avec Satan, après avoir souligné la collaboration de Dieu avec Antoine,[43] il élargit à l'ensemble des chrétiens et rappelle qu'il est ainsi permis à chacun de ceux qui luttent de dire (avec Paul): "Non pas moi, mais la grâce de Dieu qui est avec moi." Plus loin—et la construction du texte est la même que dans notre passage—, lorsqu'une vision permet à Antoine de sauver un des deux frères perdus dans le désert, il commente:

---

[40] Voir 54.6 et 66.8.

[41] On retrouverait la même chose pour le thème de la joie, qui se diffuse du Christ, "notre joie" (35.5), à Antoine, dans sa vie (50.5; 54.8; 67.6 et 8; 84.2 et 89.4) comme dans sa catéchèse (42.3,7 et 8); puis d'Antoine aux moines (44.1; 54.7), aux empereurs (81.6), à tous les affligés (87.3) et finalement à Athanase (92.3).

[42] Voir ce que dit Antoine lorsqu'il part pour le grand désert: "les gens d'ici me dérangent fréquemment et *surtout me demandent des choses qui dépassent mon pouvoir*" (49.3).

[43] 5.7: Καὶ ὁ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος κατακαυχωμένος ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου σαρκοφοροῦντος ἀνετρέπετο. Συνήργει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος αὐτῷ ὁ σάρκα δι' ἡμᾶς φορήσας. . . .; on ne saurait guère souligner davantage l'importance fondamentale de l'incarnation, source de toutes les victoires.

> Et si l'on se demande pourquoi il n'avait pas dit cela avant que le premier fût mort, on a tort de se le demander. Οὐ γὰρ ἦν Ἀντωνίου τὸ τοῦ θανάτου κρῖμα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καὶ περὶ ἐκείνου κρίναντος καὶ περὶ τούτου δείξαντος καὶ ἀποκαλύψαντος. La seule chose admirable chez Antoine, c'est qu'assis sur la montagne, il gardait son coeur vigilant alors que le Seigneur lui montrait ce qui se passait au loin (59.6).

Et il fait parler de même le "maître d'ascèse": dans son grand discours d'abord, il met en garde contre l'orgueil qu'on pourrait tirer des guérisons ou des exorcismes en des termes auxquels l'introduction de notre séquence (83-84.1-2) fait écho: "Que nos noms aient été inscrits dans le ciel, c'est là un témoignage de notre vertu et de notre vie, mais chasser les démons, c'est la grâce du Seigneur qui l'a donnée";[44] puis, dès la première guérison, il avertit Martinien: "Je ne suis qu'un homme, tout comme toi. Mais si tu crois au Christ, que je sers, va, prie Dieu de toute ta foi, et cela se fera,"[45] avertissement qu'il répétera inlassablement.[46] Ainsi, à travers ces répétitions, la *Vie d'Antoine*, parfaite illustration de la leçon finale: "Notre Seigneur et Sauveur glorifie ceux qui le glorifient" (94.1), peut être lue à peu près autant comme une glorification de la puissance de Dieu que de son fidèle serviteur Antoine, qui la manifeste: source de la victoire de l'ascète,[47] la puissance de Dieu ouvre très naturellement cette séquence récapitulative.

Ainsi "adossée" à la puissance divine, quelle doit être la *politeia* de l'ascète? Unissant la prière à l'ascèse, elle s'incarne dans le portrait du "Sage sur la montagne," tel Élie, partagé entre la joie de la contemplation et le

---

[44] 38.3; tout le chapitre est bâti autour de cette idée et mériterait d'être cité; voir aussi 40.6, où la même idée est reprise dans les récits personnels d'Antoine.

[45] 48.5; il répercute ainsi les paroles du Seigneur citées dans notre texte: qui a la foi peut tout obtenir.

[46] 58.4: "Un tel rétablissement ne m'appartient pas. Inutile donc de venir vers un homme misérable comme moi. Guérir appartient au Seigneur qui fait miséricorde en tout lieu à ceux qui l'invoquent"; 62.2: "Il demandait que personne ne l'admire pour cela (*scil.* ses visions) mais qu'on admire plutôt le Seigneur qui nous a fait à nous les hommes, la grâce de le connaître selon nos forces"; 80.6: "Ce n'est pas nous qui le faisons (*scil.* exorciser), mais c'est le Christ qui le fait par ceux qui croient en lui"; même Amoun, dans sa fugitive apparition, reprend la même leçon: il dit qu'"il n'avait pas marché sur l'eau, car cela était absolument impossible aux hommes, mais seulement à notre Seigneur et à ceux à qui il l'accorde, comme il l'avait fait pour le grand apôtre Pierre" (60.9).

[47] Le grand discours d'Antoine, pour montrer aux moines la possibilité de vaincre les démons, ne cesse de rappeler la puissance de Dieu, qui la fonde, et la faiblesse des démons, ce qui contribue à faire du texte une célébration de la puissance divine.

déplaisir d'être troublé par les autres dans sa vie spirituelle. Ainsi apparaît dès cette première esquisse de portrait la tension entre recueillement et charité, la difficulté, mais aussi la nécessité de trouver un équilibre entre les deux,[48] qui se traduit, dans la symbolique spatiale de la *Vita*, par des séries d'allées-venues d'Antoine de la montagne intérieure à la montagne extérieure. Jusque là c'était surtout pour guider les moines qu'il se déplaçait, mais dans notre passage, il cède à la pression des juges: il s'agit donc du rôle social du Père des moines, de sa sollicitude pour les chrétiens qui ne sont pas moines. L'exposé se fait en deux temps: une présentation générale, sur le mode itératif, de ses visites, puis un récit particulier,[49] où il explique au *dux*, qui veut le retenir, que l'élément du moine est le désert.[50] Ainsi, par-delà l'*ôpheleia* dispensée aux juges et aux accusés,[51] c'est d'abord l'attachement du moine à Dieu qui est ici souligné.[52] Il n'est que de regarder la conclusion de chacun des chapitres: le premier s'achève sur un rappel de l'amour d'Antoine pour sa montagne;[53] le second sur l'admiration du *dux*, convaincu que c'est l'amour de Dieu qui donne à Antoine tant d'esprit.[54] Celui-ci vient en effet de lui expliquer ce que signifie pour lui la montagne intérieure; s'il part, ce n'est pas par un désir égoïste, c'est que le moine

---

[48] Dans la *Vita*, on peut noter qu'Antoine est très régulièrement présenté parmi les autres: l'attachement des villageois est souligné des la première étape de l'ascèse (4.1); la sortie du fort (14) se fait sur les pressions des autres et, si Antoine n'en est pas troublé, il est ainsi auréolé de l'admiration des autres; arrivé dans le désert intérieur, dans ce qui sera désormais sa "demeure propre" et le lieu cher à son coeur (ἠγάπησε, 50.1), il pense à épargner les peines à ses fils et se met à la culture. Sur le problème posé à l'évêque et sa politique d'élévation des moines à l'épiscopat, voir A. Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e^ siècle (328-373)*, Collection de l'École française de Rome, 216, 1996, pp. 687-690.

[49] 84.5: Πάσχων οὖν ἀνάγκην καὶ ὁρῶν αὐτοὺς (les prévenus) ὀδυρομένους, ἤρχετο . . .; 85.1: Ποτὲ γοῦν βίαν τοιαύτην παθὼν. . . .

[50] Le mot passera dans les *Apophtegmes* (α Ant. 10; syst. II. 1).

[51] Le vocabulaire de l'utilité est très dense en 84.5 et 6 (οὐκ ἀνωφελής; εἰς ὄνησιν καὶ εἰς εὐεργεσίαν; ὠφέλει . . .).

[52] Renforçant encore la cohérence thématique de la séquence, après avoir rappelé que la puissance de Dieu est à l'origine des *thaumata* du moine, Athanase fait rappeler aux juges par Antoine la puissance de Dieu qui les jugera comme ils auront jugé.

[53] Πλὴν ὅτι τὴν ἐν τῷ ὄρει διατριβὴν πάντων μᾶλλον ἠγάπα (84.6). Le mouvement est exactement inverse de celui du chapitre 45, où il est dit d'abord qu'Antoine, tout occupé des choses spirituelles, avait honte de manger devant les autres et "mangeait donc seul . . . mais aussi souvent avec ses frères, αἰδούμενος μὲν ἐπὶ τούτοις, παρρησιαζόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπὲρ ὠφελείας λόγοις." Dans ce texte, l'utilité l'emporte, mais il remplit alors sa mission de Père spirituel.

[54] Πόθεν γὰρ ἰδιώτῃ τοιοῦτος νοῦς, εἰ μὴ ἦν ἀγαπώμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ;

ne *peut* pas vivre parmi les hommes, loin du désert qui est son élément vital, comme la mer pour les poissons: "Il faut donc que, comme le poisson vers la mer, nous nous hâtions vers la montagne *pour ne pas oublier les choses intérieures*" (85.4). On est bien ici au coeur de la spiritualité du moine et la valeur spirituelle de la montagne ressort encore mieux si on regarde le texte parallèle de l'*Apophtegme*; marqué par le développement de l'institution monastique, il évoque le retour "à la cellule" et l'oubli "de la garde intérieure." Mais, dans le texte d'Athanase, le neutre substantivé très vague qu'il emploie (τὰ ἔνδον) dépasse la simple "garde du coeur,"[55] pour suggérer la substance même de la vie spirituelle, cette θεωρία τῶν θείων dont parlait le début du texte, ce royaume qui est en nous évoqué au chapitre 20.[56] Et à travers la comparaison des poissons, c'est l'image de celui qui ne vit que pour et par Dieu qui se dessine.[57] C'est bien ainsi que le voit le *dux*, qui reconnaît en lui un véritable "serviteur de Dieu,"[58] aimé et inspiré par Dieu, qui seul peut faire parler ainsi l'homme simple, l'*idiôtès* qu'il est. Affleure ici un autre aspect important de l'Antoine d'Athanase, qui, comme Pierre et Jean devant le Sanhédrin, sait parler avec assurance un langage "assaisonné du sel divin" (73.4) alors qu'il est censé n'avoir aucune instruction. La chose est probablement fausse,[59] mais sa fausseté même invite à réfléchir au sens de ce détail. D'abord—et ceci reste dans la tonalité dominante du passage—il accentue la proximité de Dieu et du saint, directement

---

[55] Fort important aussi dans la *Vita*, c'est un des premiers thèmes de la catéchèse d'Antoine (21.2) et un des éléments majeurs de sa propre ascèse, toute de tension; mais il semble qu'ici on ait dépassé ce stade et qu'Antoine ait atteint une plénitude spirituelle où l'effort n'est plus sensible.

[56] On trouve le même effort d'épure suggestif de la spiritualité dans l'emploi absolu du verbe *ekluontai*: loin du désert, les moines "se brisent," perdent la tension essentielle à leur ascèse; l'*Apophtegme*, lui, exprime le complément (πρὸς τὸν τῆς ἡσυχίας τόνον).

[57] L'image a perduré dans la littérature monastique, mais en perdant peu à peu de la force spirituelle qu'avait su lui donner Athanase. Au comble de l'affadissement, on lit dans un sermon de 1254 de Hugues de Digne, rapporté par Joinville (cité dans l'édition des *Sources Chrétiennes*): "Car les Saintes Écritures nous disent que le moine ne peut vivre hors de son cloître sans péché mortel, pas plus que les poissons ne peuvent vivre sans eau."

[58] Δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ; même expression chez Antoine pour chasser les démons en 52.3 et 53.2.

[59] On sait que le crédit d'Athanase a été tel qu'il a longtemps fait refuser à Antoine la paternité des lettres transmises sous son nom; voir sur ce point, outre l'article de M. de Durand cité n. 1, l'ouvrage de S. Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Anthony. Origenist Theology, Monastic Tradition and the Making of a Saint*, Lund University Press, 1990.

instruit par Dieu,[60] et fait ressortir la puissance de Dieu,[61] ce qui amène à s'interroger sur le sens exact à donner à l'adjectif *charien* qui qualifie le *paradeigma* des poissons employé par Antoine. À son sens "ordinaire" (païen) d'"aimable," de "propre à l'homme cultivé"—ce qui est paradoxal—,[62] s'ajoute peut-être l'idée d'une *charis* divine qui explique le paradoxe: on aurait ainsi un mot d'Antoine doublement "spirituel." La même question vaut pour le *nous* qu'admire le *dux* (85.5), "esprit" qui est intelligence,[63] mais qui évoque aussi la partie spirituelle de l'âme: sans doute n'y a-t-il pas lieu de distinguer les deux chez celui auquel Dieu insuffle son intelligence. En tout cas, on ne peut lire ce passage sans le rapprocher du débat sur la primauté du *nous* ou des *grammata* qui a opposé victorieusement Antoine aux philosophes païens et permis à Athanase d'introduire le thème de l'*idiôtès*, débat qui, lui-même, faisait écho à l'opposition évoquée au chapitre 20 par Antoine entre les païens qui "traversent les mers pour apprendre les *grammata*" et nous, qui pouvons trouver en nous le royaume, en maintenant la partie spirituelle de l'âme (τὸ νοερόν) dans son état naturel.

Athanase s'applique ainsi à incarner en Antoine un idéal "anti-intellectuel," et la chose lui tient tellement à coeur qu'il y insiste dans le cours

---

[60] Le chapitre 66 souligne cette qualité de *theodidaktos* étudiée par Y. de Andia (*art. cit.* n. 8) et G. Couilleau, La liberté d'Antoine *in Commandements du Seigneur et Libération évangélique*, Studia Anselmiana 70, 1977, 13-40.

[61] Tel est le but que Paul assigne au choix de paroles simples pour sa prédication ("afin que votre foi ne soit pas fondée sur la sagesse des hommes, mais sur la puissance de Dieu," I *Cor.* 2.4); telle est surtout la réponse d'Origène à Celse raillant le ramassis de moins-que-rien qu'étaient les apôtres: "Je rétorque: un examen sensé et judicieux de la conduite des Apôtres de Jésus montre que *par la puissance divine* ils enseignaient le christianisme et réussissaient à soumettre les hommes à la parole de Dieu. Ils ne possédaient ni éloquence naturelle ni ordonnance de leur message selon les procédés dialectiques des Grecs qui entraînent les auditeurs. Mais il me semble que si Jésus avait choisi des hommes savants au regard de l'opinion publique, capables de saisir et d'exprimer des idées chères aux foules, pour en faire les ministres de son enseignement, il eût justement prêté au soupçon d'avoir prêché suivant une méthode semblable à celle des philosophes chefs d'école et le caractère divin de sa doctrine n'aurait pas paru dans toute son évidence.... Notre foi, pareille à celle qu'on accorde aux doctrines des philosophes de ce monde, reposerait sur 'la sagesse des hommes' et non sur la '*puissance de Dieu*'" (*C. Celse* I. 62).

[62] On le trouvait déjà en 73.4, où, au grand étonnement des philosophes, cet homme, nourri à la montagne, se montrait χαριεὶς καὶ πολιτικός, avec un langage assaisonné du sel divin.

[63] La même réaction d'admiration a été exprimée chez les philosophes par τοσαύτην ἔβλεπον ἐν ἰδιώτῃ σύνεσιν (73.3)—mais c'est l'interprétation des païens—.

même du grand discours. D'entrée, il fait souligner par le Père des Moines que "les Écritures suffisent πρὸς διδασκαλίαν" (16.1) et qu'il s'agira seulement de "s'encourager à la lutte"[64] en parlant de son expérience (16.2); de même, au moment d'aborder la catéchèse sur les démons, il abandonne à "de plus grands que nous" les considérations théoriques "sur leur nature et leur diversité" (21.5), pour s'appuyer à nouveau sur son expérience (22.4). Enfin, il faut remarquer l'insistance curieuse avec laquelle Athanase signale ici, alors qu'Antoine est au milieu de ses fils, et non face à des philosophes grecs, qu'il s'exprime en copte:[65] trace peut-être de la politique d'union du "Biblisme copte et de la thèologie d'Alexandrie," selon l'analyse de W.H.C. Frend,[66] elle aboutit surtout à démarquer nettement Antoine des intellectuels du didascalée, au moment même où il exerce son activité d'enseignement, et il paraît difficile de ne pas souscrire aux conclusions de D. Brakke, qui voit dans le procédé de l'évêque, une manière de mettre en contraste "*the ascetic discipline of concrete service to God with the intellectual life of disputation and theory and hence not only Christianity with the world, but also the Christianity of the Athanasian episcopate with the Christianity of the schoolroom.*"[67] La simplicité de l'esprit comme la pureté de coeur, l'attachement exclusif à Dieu dont il est le serviteur et l'instrument, le "relais" auprès des hommes: tels sont donc les traits essentiels de la spiritualité du moine que veut fixer Athanase en cette fin de biographie. Mais déjà, dans ce premier mouvement, il a rappelé les devoirs de la charité et l'*ôpheleia* d'Antoine: cette utilité, réalisation de la mission divine, s'épanouit dans le second mouvement de la séquence.

Le moine, père spirituel

Celui-ci commence, de façon inattendue, par le récit de la mort du *dux* Balacius. Sans doute passe-t-on, par un enchaînement des idées assez lâche, d'un *dux* anonyme, interlocuteur admiratif d'Antoine dans le chapitre précédent, à un autre *dux* nommément désigné celui-là et persécuteur des orthodoxes, auquel Antoine annonce dans une lettre la colère de Dieu, mais ce jeu de contraste reste des plus formels et c'est dans sa phrase de conclusion qu'Athanase remet son récit en perspective avec un Οὕτω μὲν οὖν τοῖς πικροτέροις παρήνει, avant de poursuivre: τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους τοὺς πρὸς αὐτὸν

[64] 16.1: ἀλείφειν, littéralement "s'oindre d'huile" avant la lutte.

[65] 16.1: la mention d'un interprète est plus naturelle en 74.2 et 77.1.

[66] Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian Leader in the Fourth Century, *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries*, London, 1976, Nr XVI.

[67] *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995, p. 257.

ἀπαντῶντας οὕτως ἐνουθέτει ὡς . . . Les verbes sont sans ambiguïté et renvoient à la fonction de Père spirituel dispensant à tous ses avertissements dévolue à Antoine. Parénèse et utilité sont en effet les deux thèmes qui font l'unité des chapitres 86-88: après que le chapitre 86 a montré ses avertissements au *pikroteros* qu'est Balacius, le chapitre 87 s'étend sur le réconfort moral et spirituel qu'il apportait à chacun,[68] avant que le chapitre 88 se concentre sur l'élément essentiel de la vie spirituelle, la lutte contre les démons, qu'il "enseignait" à chacun;[69] la conclusion reprend le même thème en le pérennisant: tous désormais n'ont plus pour se consoler que son souvenir, κατέχοντες ἅμα τὰς νουθεσίας καὶ τὰς παραινέσεις αὐτοῦ (§ 3).

Cette ultime image se trouve ainsi dans la droite ligne de la grande catéchèse de 16-43, au point que l'on peut même dégager un jeu d'échos thématique entre ce discours et notre passage. Ses admonitions, est-il dit au début du chapitre 87,[70] tendaient à faire "oublier immédiatement les affaires judiciaires"[71]—c'est-à-dire les conflits d'intérêt, les biens terrestres—et "proclamer bienheureux ceux qui se retirent à l'écart de cette vie"—c'est-à-dire mettre au-dessus de tout les anachorètes et l'anachorèse qui leur permet de retrouver en eux le royaume céleste—. Or, s'ils sont alors adressés à des gens qui ont déjà choisi la retraite, ce sont bien les mêmes thèmes qu'on lit aux chapitres 16-20, prélude à l'appel à la "garde du coeur,"[72] lui-même prélude au long développement sur la lutte contre les démons, qui occupe toute la suite du discours. De même ici, après que le chapitre 87 a montré la consolation de tous les affligés, auxquels Antoine, à chaque fois, rappelle l'essentiel, Dieu,[73] le chapitre 88 insiste sur le charisme du discernement des esprits donné par Dieu à Antoine[74] et la lutte contre les démons à laquelle chacun, après l'avoir écouté, s'en va ὥσπερ ἐπαλειφθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῦ. L'image de l'onction d'huile que se faisait l'athlète ou le lutteur avant l'épreuve est un nouvel élément de continuité;

---

[68] Ce qui lui vaut le titre de "médecin de l'Egypte" (§ 3).

[69] 88.1: τοὺς ἐνοχλουμένους ἐν λογισμοῖς παρ' ἐκείνων (*scil.* τῶν δαιμόνων) ἐδίδασκεν.

[70] Après le ὡς sur lequel j'ai interrompu la citation *supra*.

[71] Par-delà l'anecdote de Balacius, on peut voir dans ce cas précis de souci des choses temporelles un élément de continuité avec les chapitres 84-85.

[72] 21.2-3, où le texte des *Proverbes* (4, 23) qui contient l'expression est ainsi glosé: ἐχθροὺς γὰρ ἔχομεν δεινοὺς καὶ πανούργους τοὺς πονηροὺς δαίμονας.

[73] Comme il l'a fait pour les empereurs (81.5) et les juges (84.6).

[74] Thème qui apparaît pour la première fois au début du développement sur les démons en 22.3: "C'est pourquoi (*scil.* à cause de l'hostilité des démons contre les chrétiens) il faut beaucoup de prières et d'ascèse pour pouvoir, après avoir reçu de l'Esprit - seule mention de celui-ci dans toute la *Vita*- le charisme du discernement des esprits. . . ."

le même verbe était déjà employé pour peindre le soutien moral apporté par le moine aux martyrs,[75] et, sous sa forme simple, il ouvrait la grande catéchèse: ἡμᾶς δὲ καλὸν παρακαλεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ ἀλείφειν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις (16.1).

S'affirme ainsi l'image du Père spirituel, dont l'action était en germe dès sa sortie du fort. Il vaut la peine de relire les charismes qui étaient alors indiqués:

> Le Seigneur guérit par son intermédiaire beaucoup de ceux qui étaient présents et souffraient dans leur corps et il en purifia d'autres des démons. Il donnait à Antoine une grâce dans ses paroles, de sorte qu'il consolait beaucoup d'affligés et en réconciliaient d'autres qui se disputaient. Il disait à tous de ne rien préférer de ce qui est dans le monde à l'amour du Christ. Dans ses entretiens il faisait souvenir des biens futurs et de l'amour de Dieu pour les hommes, lui qui n'avait pas épargné son propre fils, mais l'avait livré pour nous tous. Il persuada ainsi beaucoup de gens d'embrasser la vie solitaire. (14.5-7)

C'est bien la même "grâce" consolatrice que dispensent ses paroles dans cet ultime portrait, apaisant chagrin et colère (87.3), réconfortant le pauvre comme le moine qui a failli (87.4), amenant par sa seule vue[76] le jeune homme à la chasteté (87.5), et, plus généralement, dissipant troubles et tentations démoniaques (87.5-6);[77] c'est aussi la même force d'attraction spirituelle qui s'exerce. L'identité des charismes d'un passage à l'autre ne fait que mieux ressortir la disparition des guérisons:[78] "médecin de l'Égypte," Antoine est un médecin des âmes et le seul charisme qui soit souligné ici est celui du discernement des esprits;[79] à nouveau, cette ultime image

---

[75] 46.2: Πολλή τε ἦν αὐτῷ σπουδὴ ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, ἀγωνιζομένους μέν τοὺς καλουμένους ἐπαλείφειν εἰς προθυμίαν. . . .

[76] De même, c'est "à l'entendre et à le voir" que le pauvre se prend à mépriser la richesse (§ 4): Antoine prêche par ses paroles comme par son exemple.

[77] L'amour de la tempérance inspiré au jeune homme est déjà une lutte contre le démon, dont les désirs charnels sont "les premiers pièges contre les jeunes gens" (5.3); quant au trouble des pensées, c'est aussi un de ses premiers modes d'attaque contre Antoine (*ibidem*) et, d'une manière générale, la conséquence de l'apparition des mauvais esprits (36.2); en ramenant la sérénité—cette sérénité qui émane de son visage (67.8)—, Antoine produit à peu près le même sentiment que les bons esprits et les saints (36.3-4).

[78] Le chapitre 84 les a mentionnées d'entrée pour rappeler qu'elles ne relèvent que de Dieu: on comprend donc qu'elles ne réapparaissent plus lorsqu'Athanase s'attache à délimiter strictement le domaine d'Antoine (cf. 84.2: Ἀντωνίου δὲ μόνον ἦν . . .).

[79] 88.1: καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἦν μέγα τῆς ἀσκήσεως Ἀντωνίου ὅτι, καθὰ προεῖπον, χάρισμα διακρίσεως πνευμάτων ἔχων, ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτῶν τὰ κινήματα; cette "connaissance" sera aussi, dans la tradition monastique, la connaissance essentielle du moine dépourvu de

d'Antoine s'accorde pleinement avec les leçons qu'il a dispensées au cours de la biographie, lorsque, mettant en garde les moines contre le désir de recevoir des dons extraordinaires, il soulignait que seul ce charisme méritait de faire l'objet de nos prières.[80] Athanase lui-même l'a aussi préparée dans la narration, d'abord immédiatement après le grand discours, en faisant de ce charisme celui qui suscitait l'admiration des autres et les incitait au combat,[81] puis dans la grande séquence des *thaumata.* Non seulement Antoine y répète sans cesse que ce n'est pas lui, pauvre homme, mais Dieu qui guérit,[82] mais ses dénégations pleines d'humilité prennent un tour catéchétique et, dès le premier chapitre de la séquence (56), où il prie avec les malades en leur rappelant qu'il dépend de Dieu que certains soient guéris et d'autres non, Athanase souligne que les *paroles* du vieillard étaient pour les malades "comme une guérison, puisqu'ils *apprenaient* eux aussi à ne pas se décourager, mais plutôt à prendre patience."[83]

Ainsi concentrée sur l'essentiel—le profit spirituel tiré de son enseignement—, l'image d'Antoine "Père des Moines" se dilate aux dimensions de l'*oikouménè.* À nouveau il suffit de suivre la récurrence des termes; on lit au chapitre 87: οὕτω δὲ πάλιν πρὸς ὠφέλειαν πᾶσιν ἦν ἱκανός, ὡς πολλοὺς . . . ἀποτίθεσθαι τὰ τοῦ βίου βάρη, rappel de l'incitation vivante à la retraite qu'il est pour les Égyptiens depuis le chapitre 14, cité *supra.* Puis le chapitre 88 va plus loin et évoque la venue des gens ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξω μερῶν, dont le résumé du séjour conjoint utilité et paternité: καὶ αὐτοὶ μετὰ πάντων τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἐσχηκότες ὑπέστρεφον ὡς παρὰ πατρὸς προπεμπόμενοι (88.3). Ainsi sont posés dans la narration les prodromes d'un élargissement qui sera parachevé par la rédaction même de la *Vita,* qu'Athanase, dans le prologue déja, adressait aux moines par-delà les mers,[84] et qui, dans l'envoi final, est destinée aussi aux païens (94.2).

---

culture (*cf. DS, sv.* "*Idiota,*" t. 7-2, 1242-1248 et "Direction spirituelle en Orient," t. 3, 1025-26).

[80] 38.5: Καθόλου δὲ εὔχεσθαι δεῖ, καθὰ προεῖπον, λαμβάνειν χάρισμα διακρίσεως πνευμάτων, ἵνα, καθὼς γέγραπται, μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύωμεν.

[81] 44.1: Πάντες τε ἐπείθοντο καταφρονεῖν τῆς δαιμονικῆς ἐπιβουλῆς, θαυμάζοντες τὴν δοθεῖσαν παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου χάριν τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ εἰς τὴν διάκρισιν τῶν πνευμάτων.

[82] 48.2; 58.4; 59.5; 62.2.

[83] 56.2: Οἱ οὖν πάσχοντες ὡς θεραπείαν ἐδέχοντο καὶ τοὺς λόγους τοῦ γέροντος, μανθάνοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ μὴ ὀλιγωρεῖν, μακροθυμεῖν δὲ μᾶλλον.

[84] C'est l'indication qu'on tire des §§ 4 (Μὴ παύσεσθε τοὺς ἐνθένδε πλέοντας ἐρωτᾶν) et 5 (Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν πλωίμων συνέκλεισε . . .) du Prologue; le titre, sous quelque forme qu'il se présente, mentionne toujours τοὺς ἐν τῇ ξένῃ μοναχούς: contre l'opinion courante qu'il s'agirait de moines d'Occident, A. Martin juge plus vraisem-

Cette correspondance entre le contenu du texte et la démarche du biographe se poursuit jusque dans le style: réalisant la promesse du Seigneur à Antoine de le "rendre célèbre en tous lieux" (10.3), montrant à tous que "Notre Seigneur et Sauveur Jésus-Christ glorifie ceux qui le glorifient" (94.1), le texte prend une tonalité de célébration. Au titre de "Père" s'ajoute celui de "médecin pour l'Égypte," ou, plus exactement, ce qui rehausse encore son prestige, de médecin *donné par Dieu* à l'Égypte:[85] on ne peut pas ne pas songer en lisant ce texte à l'image du Christ médecin,[86] dont Antoine est ainsi à nouveau le relais, mais il ne faut pas non plus négliger l'emploi du verbe "donner," en se souvenant que la séquence a commencé par l'injonction du Seigneur à ses disciples: Δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε. Alors qu'il n'était question dans ce passage que de donner ce que l'on a reçu—injonction suivie par Antoine—, c'est Antoine lui-même qui devient maintenant un don de Dieu et ce glissement participe de l'agrandissement insensible de sa figure. Y contribue encore le style oratoire qu'adopte alors Athanase, développant les "soins" du médecin par une série de huit questions rhétoriques, puis introduisant solennellement le charisme du discernement des esprits,[87] avant de revenir à un tour mi-exclamatif, mi-interrogatif pour en illustrer les effets: "Combien de vierges, même déjà fiancées, pour avoir seulement vu Antoine de loin, demeurèrent vierges pour le Christ?" (88.2).

À travers l'action d'Antoine, c'est ainsi l'image d'une Église combattante qui se dessine, l'Église même d'Athanase, au temps de la "décade d'or," selon la description qu'il en donne dans l'*Histoire des Ariens aux Moines*:[88]

> Combien de femmes non mariées et qui étaient prêtes à entrer dans le mariage, restèrent vierges pour le Christ! Combien de jeunes gens, voyant les exemples des autres, embrassèrent la vie monastique! Combien de pères persuadèrent leurs enfants et combien furent convaincus par leurs enfants de ne pas s'écarter de l'ascétisme chrétien. . . .

Ce texte, qui passe encore en revue femmes, veuves et orphelins est plus riche: l'évêque a en charge toute la chrétienté et n'a garde d'oublier per-

---

blable que la *Vita* soit destinée aux moines de Palestine (où le mouvement monastique est déjà développé).

[85] 87.3: Καὶ ὅλως ὥσπερ ἰατρὸς ἦν δοθεὶς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.

[86] Comme le signale M.-A. Vannier, *art. cit.* n. 2 elle-même renvoie à J.-R. Bouchet, Le Christ vrai médecin, *La Vie spirituelle* 634 (1979), 679-688.

[87] Texte cité *supra*, n. 79.

[88] Ch. 25, *PG* XXV, 721 (traduction G. Bardy *in Saint Athanase*, p. 101, citée dans l'édition du *DIV, Sources Chrétiennes* 18, p. 303).

sonne; mais le moine est engagé dans la même action. C'est cette implication d'Antoine dans l'Église d'Égypte et dans les combats d'Athanase[89] qu'il faut regarder de plus près en replaçant la séquence dans l'ensemble du texte.

Le prophète de l'Église d'Égypte

Antoine "avait été donné par Dieu pour médecin à l'Egypte": nous avons commenté l'image du médecin, l'emploi du verbe "donner"; reste la référence à l'Égypte. La rareté des mentions de celle-ci[90] lui donne un relief accru: ainsi le Saint se trouve expressément situé dans son cadre géographique et historique. Un autre évêque égyptien, Sérapion de Thmuis, le présentait dans une lettre comme le "Grand intercesseur," qui, "produisant continuellement le suave parfum de ses prières, retint la colère suspendue en haut, ne lui permettant pas de descendre."[91] Les interprètes divergent sur l'ampleur des pouvoirs ainsi conférés à Antoine par le moine-évêque qui fut peut-être son compagnon et la source majeure d'Athanase.[92] On comprend que le patriarche d'Alexandrie ait voulu donner son interprétation de la figure d'Antoine: quelles qu'aient été la pensée de Sérapion[93] et ses divergences avec lui, même sans intention polémique, il se devait d'intégrer dans la communauté ecclésiale le saint moine, qui risquait de s'en séparer tant par sa solitude de moine que par ses charismes de saint; il lui fallait contrôler le développement du culte des Saints, tel que le pratiquaient en particulier les Mélétiens[94] et en bien marquer les limites; mais ce n'était là qu'un des aspects pris par les désaccords d'une communauté déchirée par les hérésies, et dans ces affres aussi la parénèse d'Antoine avait un rôle à jouer.

Il semble donc que cette sorte de *cauda* que constituent les chapitres

---

[89] Sur Athanase et la chrétienté d'Égypte, voir A. Martin, *op. cit.*, ch. X, p. 637 sq.

[90] L'Égypte est la terre des moines (Prol. 1; 3.2), mais les païens sont désignés comme "Égyptiens" lorsqu'il est question de magie—devenue inopérante grâce au Christ—(79.1); c'est le *genos* (3.2) et la langue d'Antoine (16.1); on ne tire pas grand chose de 57.2 (Égypte comme lieu de guérison de Fronton); quant aux deux occurrences de la fin du texte, elles seront analysées au cours de mon développement.

[91] *Lettre sur la mort d'Antoine*, 10.

[92] M. Tetz, Athanasius und die *Vita Antonii*, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73, 1983, 1-30.

[93] C'est-à-dire qu'il donne une autonomie excessive au pouvoir du saint (selon D. Brakke, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-213) ou non (selon S. Rubenson, *op cit.*, p. 165, n. 3).

[94] Voir A. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 699 sq.

83-88 non seulement fixe l'image d'Antoine, mais loin d'en faire seulement un modèle chrétien universellement valable, la situe dans son cadre égyptien. "En amont," le chapitre 82 déjà le montre voyant et exposant à Sérapion—justement—τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γινόμενα: suit une première vision anti-arienne; puis, "en aval," le récit de mort fait une large place à son opposition aux rites funéraires *égyptiens*;[95] entre les deux, la séquence qui nous intéresse, avant d'en arriver à conférer à Antoine le titre de "médecin de l'Égypte" en 87.3, raconte en 86 la mort du *dux* d'Égypte Balacius, et, avant cette mort, évoque les face-à-face d'Antoine avec les juges, qu'on peut considérer comme la réplique égyptienne de sa correspondance avec les Empereurs: les juges et le *dux* ne sont-ils pas aussi les représentants d'un pouvoir temporel dont ils ne doivent pas oublier qu'il est inférieur et soumis à la puissance de Dieu? Et, après avoir rappelé aux souverains que le seul *basileus* véritable et éternel est le Christ (81.5), Antoine ne rappelle-t-il pas, parallèlement, aux juges qu'ils "seront jugés comme ils auront jugé" (84.6), exhortant les uns et les autres à la justice?[96] Dans ces passages s'esquisse l'image du saint défenseur des pauvres[97] en même temps que s'ébauche le problème des rapports entre pouvoir de l'Église et pouvoir politique. La question reste à l'état d'ébauche, sans doute parce qu'Antoine n'est qu'un moine, qui peut rappeler la puissance de Dieu, mais ne représente pas la hiérarchie ecclésiastique, comme le fera Saint Martin, moine-évêque que Sulpice Sévère montre au festin de Maxime (*VSM* 20,1) "défendant les droits imprescriptibles du pouvoir sacerdotal avant de lui prédire finalement les malheurs qui l'attendent," selon les termes de J. Fontaine, qui poursuit son commentaire du texte latin en évoquant justement la correspondance d'Antoine et des empereurs et suggérant que ces consultations par les empereurs

> sont directement liées au don de prophétie des ascètes, qui nous apparaissent dans la *Vie d'Antoine*. On pourrait même se demander s'il ne conviendrait pas

---

[95] 90.2: Οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὰ τῶν τελευτώντων σπουδαίων σώματα, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων, φιλοῦσι θάπτειν. . . .

[96] 81.6: ἠξίου . . . φροντίζειν τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τῶν πτωχῶν; 84.6: συμβουλεύων πάντων μᾶλλον προκρίνειν τὸ δίκαιον.

[97] Les empereurs ont à se soucier "du juste et des mendiants" (note précédente) et Antoine lui-même τῶν ἀδικουμένων προΐστατο (87.2), mais ce rôle social semble moins affirmé que l'enseignement spirituel qui apprend au pauvre à mépriser la richesse (87.4); sur l'attente des pauvres, voir A. Martin, p. 746 sq., et, plus généralement, P. Brown, *La société et la sacré dans l'Antiquité tardive* (trad. fr. A. Rousselle), Paris, Seuil, 1982, en part. Le saint homme: son essor et sa fonction dans l'Antiquité tardive, pp. 59-106.

> de voir déjà des tentatives de consultation analogue dans un curieux passage de cette biographie qui fait état d'une correspondance adressée à Antoine par Constantin et ses fils . . . Lorsqu'on voit Antoine, quelques pages plus loin (au ch. 86) prédire au comte Balacius, persécuteur des moines au cours de l'affaire arienne, que la colère de Dieu va s'abattre sur lui, on peut se demander si le geste attribué par Athanase aux premiers empereurs chrétiens ne visait pas à s'assurer les services de ce nouveau prophète pour éviter de recourir aux moyens traditionnels de la divination païenne.[98]

Si telles étaient les intentions des empereurs, Athanase ne le laisse aucunement pressentir: ayant d'abord souligné l'humilité d'Antoine,[99] tout juste en profite-t-il pour les inviter à s'incliner devant Dieu, ce qui est peut-être à lire comme un avertissement discret, mais précis à un moment où l'empereur se met du côté des *christomachoi.* La même chose vaut pour les juges, dont Antoine mentionne en passant, dans son ultime discours à ses fils de la montagne extérieure, le soutien aux ariens: "Même si vous voyez *les juges les défendre*, ne vous troublez pas," et, pour les réconforter, il réaffirme: "leur manifestation cessera, elle est mortelle et durera peu" (89.5).

Cette dernière phrase, comparable à la prédiction de sa fin prochaine faite par Martin à Maxime, donne au saint la stature d'un prophète. Cette dimension exceptionnelle n'est pas de soi étonnante chez un saint, la figure de Martin le montre, mais ce qui est très remarquable, c'est qu'Athanase ne l'avait nullement introduite, s'attachant au contraire à "minorer" la figure du Saint. Ainsi les visions ont-elles été liées expressément à la pureté de l'âme retrouvée grâce à l'effort ascétique,[100] tandis que leur contenu permettait à Athanase de préfigurer dans son texte le terme de l'itinéraire chrétien, l'*anodos* de l'âme,[101] et là aussi est sensible l'effort pour ne pas donner à Antoine une grandeur excessive: alors qu'il voit l'âme d'Amoun accueillie par un choeur joyeux—celui des anges—(60.1), sa propre ascension, qui lui est révélée au cours d'une extase, est marquée par un affrontement[102] entre ceux qui l'escortent (les anges) et ceux qui veulent lui interdire le

---

[98] *SC* 135, p. 940; la citation précédente figure p. 915.

[99] 81.2: "Il ne faisait pas grand cas des lettres et n'éprouvait aucune joie, mais il restait tel qu'il était avant que les empereurs lui aient écrit" (ὁ αὐτός, à rapprocher du ἴσος de 14.4, quand il voit la foule le saluer à la sortie du fortin).

[100] 60.11 dans le récit, illustration de 34.2 dans le discours.

[101] Sur cette représentation chez Athanase, constituant ici un axe vertical après la retraite "horizontale"—les deux étant rendus par le préverbe *ana-* comme l'a montré O. Munnich dans sa communication à la journée Athanase restée inédite—, voir D. Brakke, *op. cit.*, The myth of ascent and the fear of the death, 217-226.

[102] 65.3: ἀντιμαχομένων.

passage (les démons). Ainsi la lutte, caractéristique de l'ascèse, se prolonge jusque dans les visions[103] et la vision elle-même est reçue comme un appel à persévérer dans la lutte.[104]

Et voici que, soudain, au moment même où il concentre l'image du saint sur l'essentiel—spiritualité personnelle et direction spirituelle—, éloignant tous les pouvoirs qui pourraient le rapprocher des thaumaturges païens avant de récuser formellement le culte du corps des saints, voici qu'il le transforme en prophète. Agrandissement étonnant, mais qui sert le combat d'Athanase, puisque ce prophétisme est un prophétisme ecclésial,[105] exclusivement dirigé contre les ariens et d'autant plus saillant qu'il surgit dans le récit sans que rien l'ait préparé. Il apparaît en effet d'abord au chapitre 82, celui qu'on a tant de mal à intégrer dans la structure de la *Vita*, "coincé" qu'il est entre le "sommet" des relations avec le monde que constitue la correspondance avec les empereurs et le début de notre séquence 83-88 sans se rattacher nettement à aucun des deux passages.[106] Dans ce chapitre, après avoir souligné que les visions étaient devenues choses habituelles pour Antoine—ce qui, joint à une comparaison avec Daniel, a pour effet de grandir le personnage—[107] le récit s'arrête sur une vision précise, dont est témoin justement Sérapion. À défaut de "retenir la colère

---

[103] En revanche, elle disparaît de la scène "réelle" de mort où est fugitivement mentionnée la vision d'amis qui l'accueillent (92.1: ὥσπερ φίλους ὁρῶν τοὺς ἐλθόντας καὶ δι' αὐτοὺς περιχαρὴς γενόμενος—indice que ce sont de bons esprits—. . . ἐξέλιπε); cette absence de toute dramatisation est bien soulignée dans le bel article de M. Alexandre, À propos de la mort d'Antoine (Athanase, *Vie d'Antoine*, *PG* 26, 968-974, § 89-93). L'heure de la mort dans la littérature monastique, *Le Temps chrétien de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen-Age, III^e^-XIII^e^ siècles*, Paris, 1984, 263-282 -désormais cité M. Alexandre (1984)—; elle participe de "l'agrandissement" du saint dans les dernières pages de la *Vita*.

[104] Il gémit (ce qui est rare chez Athanase—*cf.* L. Brottier, La figure d'Antoine dans les *Apophtegmes*, Antoine, un pénitent inquiet, *Connaissance des Pères* n° 64, 10-11), se souvient des textes pauliniens sur les puissances de l'air et utilise son expérience pour sa catéchèse (διὸ καὶ μάλιστα παρήνει . . .). De même on peut relever un décalage entre les "miracles" d'Antoine et celui d'Amoun, plus extraordinaire (Dieu l'a transporté d'une rive à l'autre), encore que le moine de Nitrie précise qu'il n'a pu marcher sur l'eau, car cela n'est possible qu'au Seigneur et à ceux à qui il l'accorde, comme Pierre (60.9).

[105] Selon le titre d'un article de L. Leloir, qui traduit la version éthiopienne de ces derniers chapitres (*After Chalcedon. Studies in Theology and Church History* (*Mélanges A. Van Roey*), Louvain, 1985, 217-231).

[106] Voir *supra*, p. 4.

[107] "Souvent, avec ses visiteurs, assis ou se promenant, il gardait le silence, comme il est écrit en *Daniel*. Quelques heures après, il reprenait l'entretien avec les frères présents auprès de lui. Mais eux s'apercevaient qu'il avait eu une vision."

de Dieu," l'Antoine d'Athanase prédit son arrêt,[108] après avoir annoncé l'attaque imminente des ariens dans un passage très dramatisé:[109] la défaite de l'impiété est inéluctable et c'est cette défaite qui commence à se concrétiser dans la seconde manifestation du prophétisme d'Antoine que constitue la mise en garde à Balacius,[110] aussitôt suivie de la mort de celui-ci, tué par un cheval dont la douceur est mentionnée avec insistance,[111] suggérant le caractère extraordinaire d'une mort qui ne peut qu'avoir été voulue par Dieu et prend valeur d'ordalie. Les ultimes encouragements à ses fils (89.5) renforcent cette impression et manifestent dans le texte l'optimisme, le dynamisme du biographe soucieux de réconforter ses ouailles en ces heures difficiles où les adversaires de Nicée semblent triompher partout, de ne jamais paraître douter de l'issue du combat.[112]

"Nous, les chrétiens . . .": derrière Antoine, l'Église

Élément qui contribue à la présence de plus en plus forte d'Athanase, ce prophétisme ecclésial participe aussi de l'effort constant de l'évêque pour intégrer l'aventure spirituelle d'Antoine à l'intérieur du destin de l'Église: sans cesse, derrière lui, il y a "nous, les chrétiens."[113] C'est ainsi, je pense, que la prolifération démonologique, loin de n'être que "diableries," prend tout son sens: non seulement elle permet de peindre en le théâtralisant le combat spirituel du moine,[114] marque, selon l'analyse de J. Fontaine,[115] d'un âge encore "mythologique," mais elle maintient constamment en arrière-

---

[108] "Comme le Seigneur s'est mis en colère, il guérira" (§ 11).

[109] On a d'abord de grandes manifestations de douleur (§§ 4-5), puis un récit de sa vision, accompagné lui aussi de grands soupirs, (§§ 6-8) et ponctué d'un "voilà ce que vit le vieillard"; ce n'est qu'après tout cela que viennent l'explication (§§ 9-10) et enfin la consolation d'Antoine (§§ 11-13).

[110] Sur le caractère inattendu de cette scène, voir *supra*, p. 16.

[111] "C'étaient les propres chevaux de Balacius, les plus doux de toutes ses écuries (§ 5) . . . les chevaux se mirent â jouer *comme d'habitude. Soudain*, le plus doux . . . mordit Balacius" (§ 6); la soudaineté qui se détache sur fond d'habitude ajoute à l'étrangeté du fait.

[112] Voir M. de Durand, *art. cit.*, la *Vie* de Saint Antoine et la figure de Saint Athanase, p. 16.

[113] 22.2; 24.5; 28.7; 46.5; 78.1 (voir aussi 41.2 et 4, où c'est le diable qui dénonce "les chrétiens").

[114] Voir sur ce sujet les fines analyses d'O. Munnich, Les démons de Saint Antoine, *Saint Antoine entre mythe et légende*, ELLUG, 1996, 95-110.

[115] Dans son commentaire à la *VSM, Sources Chrétiennes* n° 135, p. 911; c'est avec les analyses d'Évagre qu'on entrera dans "l'âge psychologique."

plan la lutte victorieuse du Christ sur les démons et s'ancre profondément dans la sotériologie d'Athanase. Antoine ne peut lutter et vaincre que parce que le Christ a lutté et vaincu, inaugurant ainsi le temps de la Rédemption.[116] Essentiel est l'historique rapide qui, à l'orée de l'exposé démonologique du grand discours, établit l'antagonisme fondamental des démons et des chrétiens:

> . . . Déchus de la sagesse céleste, rôdant désormais autour de la terre, ils (*scil.* les démons) égarèrent les païens par leurs apparitions mensongères. Contre nous, les chrétiens, parce qu'ils nous envient, ils remuent tout dans le désir de nous barrer le chemin qui monte au ciel, pour que nous ne montions pas d'où ils sont déchus (22.2).[117]

Dans cette lutte, la victoire pour les chrétiens est sûre, car—et c'est cette fois l'introduction du second mouvement du discours, consacré à l'approfondissement théologique de la question[118] et construit sur l'opposition entre force et faiblesse—: "Depuis la venue du Seigneur, l'ennemi est déchu et ses puissances se sont affaiblies" (28.1). C'est cette faiblesse que font éclater les *phantasiai* même les plus terrifiantes: le diable n'est capable que de susciter des images; il n'a prise sur l'homme que par l'imagination, à laquelle la chute d'Adam a laissé libre cours. La description du *Contra Gentes* le montre clairement:[119]

> Au commencement, le mal n'existait pas; il n'y en a pas maintenant non plus dans les saints, et il n'existe absolument pas chez eux, mais ce sont les hommes qui par la suite ont commencé à l'imaginer (*epinoein*) et à se le représenter (*anatypousthai*) à leur ressemblance. Et c'est pourquoi ils se sont imaginé (*anaplasanto*) des idoles, considérant les choses qui ne sont pas comme si elles étaient. (*CG* 2)

Limitée à l'imaginaire, l'action des démons prend des harmoniques platoniciennes: cantonnés dans le monde du divers sensible, des *phainomena* et de la *poikilia*, ils sont peints par Athanase comme *poikillomenoi tais phantasiais* (35.3); ainsi ils sont coupés de la plénitude de l'être, relégués dans une

---

[116] Voir 37.4: "Ce qu'a dit le Seigneur, il l'a fait pour nous, afin que les démons, nous entendant dire les mêmes paroles, soient repoussés par le Seigneur qui les a employées pour les menacer."

[117] C'est en effet ce que montrent les visions de 65 et 66.

[118] Ce que marque la formule, typiquement athanasienne, "jusqu'ici je n'ai parlé de cela qu'en passant" (28.1).

[119] On comprend pourquoi le P. Couilleau parle pour la *Vita* du "cadre préfabriqué du *Contra Gentes*" (*art. cit.* à la note 58).

infériorité ontologique native, comme en témoigne le chapitre 28 qui les oppose dans leur faiblesse à l'ange véritable (*alèthinos*) du Seigneur, qui extermine les Assyriens (§ 10).[120]

La vie chrétienne se présente ainsi comme un combat contre les démons, un combat dont les ascètes occupent les avant-postes: telle est bien l'image combattante que l'on a trouvée au chapitre 88 avec tous ces lutteurs "oints" par Antoine, dont précisément Athanase détache les vierges.[121] Adversaires privilégiés des démons,[122] les moines font par leurs progrès éclater la faiblesse de ceux-ci[123] et consomment leur défaite par la floraison des ermitages. "Et le désert devint une cité,"[124] décrite en une *vision* idyllique, appuyée sur une longue citation des *Nombres*[125] et qu'il est tentant d'opposer aux *phantasiai* démoniaques.[126] Si l'hypothèse paraît quelque peu aventurée, plus sûr est le rapprochement des deux apparitions du diable à Antoine: au chapitre 6, sans doute pour éprouver son orgueil, le diable vient reconnaître sa défaite face à Antoine, le seul qui ait résisté là où tant d'autres étaient tombés; mais lorsque le Père des moines raconte à ses fils un second dialogue qui les a opposés, alors c'est cette fois la victoire *des chrétiens* que reconnaît l'Ennemi:

> Qu'ont-ils à m'accuser sans raison, les moines et tous les autres chrétiens? . . . Je n'ai plus de lieu, plus de traits, plus de ville. Partout il y a des chrétiens; aujourd'hui même le désert s'est rempli de moines (41.2 et 4).[127]

---

[120] On retrouve la même idée au chapitre 12, lorsque, sur le chemin qui le conduit au fortin, Antoine voit de l'or *véritable*; Athanase alors se sent obligé d'évoquer l'alternative: suscité par le diable ou par "quelque puissance supérieure qui voulait exercer l'athlète" (§ 1). Il me semble clair que c'est la réalité de l'or qui entraîne cette hypothèse.

[121] Passage cité *supra*, p. 15.

[122] 23.2: "Donc ci les demons voient des chrétiens—quels qu'ils soient, mais *surtout des moines*—travailler avec joie et faire des progrès. . . ."

[123] C'est ce qu'indique la belle formule προκοπτόντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενοῦσιν αὐτοί, au parallélisme parfait verbe/sujet: "c'est quand nous progressons, nous, qu'ils sont faibles, eux." (28.6).

[124] Ἡ ἔρημος ἐπολίσθη μοναχῶν (14.7), dont D. Chitty a fait le titre d'une étude (*SO* 31, Bellefontaine, 1980).

[125] "Qu'elles sont belles tes maisons, Jacob! . . ." (44.4).

[126] On a bien en introduction le participe du verbe "voir": ὥστε ἰδόντα τινὰ . . . ἀναφωνῆσαι . . .

[127] On observe le même mouvement dans la controverse avec les philosophes païens (72-80): ils viennent d'abord "pour mettre Antoine à l'épreuve" (72.1), lequel les exhorte finalement: "devenez comme moi: je suis chrétien" (§ 5); puis, dans un second temps, il est question de "demander raison de notre foi au Christ" (74.1) et le grand discours que fait alors Antoine est conclu par "Devenez comme nous" (80.6).

Derrière Antoine, Athanase

Or, dans l'Église contemporaine, les démons, toujours prêts à essayer de nouvelles machinations, ont pris le visage des ariens, comme le dit sans ambages Antoine: "Cette doctrine ne vient pas des apôtres, mais des démons et de leur père le diable, ou plutôt elle est *alogos* et *agonos*, fruit d'une pensée *ouk orthès* (82.13); *alogos*, c'est-à-dire privée du *logos*-raison, comme les mulets dont a rêvé Antoine, mais aussi du *Logos*-Verbe, qui, au contraire, gouverne le moine;[128] *ouk orthès*, alors que le Père des moines a exhorté ses fils, selon les Écritures, à rendre "droit leur coeur" et "droits leurs chemins."[129] On comprend, dans ces conditions, qu'Antoine les combatte et répète qu'il ne faut pas se souiller à leur contact,[130] comme le fait Athanase dans ses *Lettres festales.*

Cette coïncidence entre les deux catéchèses est loin d'être unique et "l'alliance" qui se noue tacitement entre le moine et l'évêque au cours du texte est le dernier trait marquant qui ressort de l'analyse de la fin de la *Vita.*[131] Elle est préparée dès le séjour à Alexandrie, où Antoine vient porter la contradiction aux ariens: son discours est en soi "un morceau d'anthologie de la théologie nicéenne,"[132] mais de plus il vient "à la requête des évêques et de tous les frères";[133] cette mention prend encore plus de relief si l'on songe qu'à son séjour précédent, au moment des persécutions de Dioclétien, Athanase n'avait pas parlé de l'évêque pour expliquer la conduite d'Antoine. Or on peut penser que c'est pour obéir à son interdiction qu'Antoine, malgré son désir, ne se livra pas.[134] Ici, au contraire,

---

[128] 14.4: ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου κυβερνώμενος; au contraire l'*alogia* est marque de la faiblesse démoniaque, qui prend, pour tenter d'effrayer, la forme d'*alogôn*, de bêtes dépourvues de raison (9.9); tous ces jeux d'échos (termes communs—folie, dommage, attaque—; images communes—animales—et thèmes communs—mensonge, *phantasia* (89.5)—) ont été relevés par O. Munnich dans sa communication citée note 101.

[129] 20.6-7 avec citation successivement de *Jos.* 24.33 et *Matt.* 3.3; on retrouve l'association du spirituel et de sa symbolisation spatiale.

[130] Le thème apparaît dès le chapitre 68, consacré à la pureté de sa foi, au § 1: (il n'a pas de relations avec eux) "estimant et déclarant que l'amitié et la fréquentation des hérétiques nuisent à l'âme et la mènent à la perdition"; après l'épisode de la vision prémonitoire, il revient dans les testaments d'Antoine en 89.6 et 91.4.

[131] C'est aussi que, historiquement, ainsi que le fait remarquer A. Martin, on se trouve dans la période de la longue vie d'Antoine qui coïncide avec celle d'Athanase.

[132] L'expression est d'A. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 487; elle renvoie, pour comparaison, à *C.Ar.*, I. 9; *LF* X (388), 9 et *Epist. ad episc. Aeg. et Lyb.* 4 et 13.

[133] 69.2: c'est l'union sacrée voulue par Athanase des moines et de la hiérarchie.

[134] 46.6: cette interdiction est connue par Eusèbe; voir note *ad loc.* dans les *Sources Chrétiennes* (p. 259).

outre cette mention initiale, on trouve, au moment du départ, la seule première personne du pluriel de tout le texte:[135] "alors qu'il s'en allait et que *nous l'accompagnions*, quand *nous arrivâmes* à la porte de la ville, une femme cria derrière . . . L'ayant entendue et *à notre demande*, le vieillard consentit à attendre" (71.1 et 2). Ce "nous," qui a embarrassé M. Tetz et dont A. Martin explique de façon fort convaincante qu'il renvoie "aux 'évêques' réunis à Alexandrie pour le concile . . . dans lesquels se fond Athanase, comme Pakhôme ou Antoine lui-même parmi leurs moines, en signe d'humilité"[136] a aussi pour effet de mettre fugitivement côte à côte le moine et l'évêque au moment de la première lutte contre les ariens, de sceller d'entrée leur alliance.

La séquence de mort les rapproche davantage encore,[137] d'abord avec les recommandations sur les rites funéraires. Athanase, narrateur, prend soin d'indiquer que cette préoccupation tenait depuis longtemps au coeur du moine: "Antoine à ce sujet demandait souvent *même aux évêques* de donner des avis aux peuples; il faisait honte aussi aux laïcs et réprimandait les femmes . . ." (90.3) et Athanase, évêque, ne dit pas autre chose.[138] Devenu ainsi conseiller des évêques, le moine en fait aussi ses héritiers et les commentateurs ont dès longtemps relevé que les legs respectaient la hiérarchie: les mélotes aux évêques, le cilice aux moines.[139] Mais si l'on regarde d'encore un peu plus près, on s'aperçoit qu'Athanase et Sérapion, les deux évêques, ne sont pas exactement traités de même: le patriarche d'Alexandrie, cité le premier comme de juste, reçoit la première mélote mais aussi le manteau sur lequel couchait Antoine, ὅπερ αὐτὸς μέν μοι[140] καινὸν δέδωκεν, παρ' ἐμοὶ δὲ πεπαλαίωται (91.8). Ce détail, qui s'accorde bien avec la politique

---

[135] Si l'on excepte les "nous, les chrétiens," qui ne sont évidemment pas du même ordre.

[136] *Art. cit.* à la note 3, p. 173, n. 17; M. Tetz (*art. cit.* à la note 91, pp. 23-24) proposait de voir dans ce "nous" la trace du témoignage de Sérapion.

[137] Entre les deux, les thèmes communs, comme on l'a vu, se multiplient: après le discours anti-arien (69), on a, avec l'apologétique contre les philosophes païens (72-80), "la version abrégée d'une pensée amplement développée dans le *CG-DIV*" (P.F. Beatrice), puis à nouveau les exhortations contre les ariens (82) et la vision d'une Église combattante (88.2).

[138] Le texte de 90.2, sur les rites égyptiens (avec *thaptein* signifiant "momifier," ce que ne rend pas G.J.M. Bartelink) est traduit par A. Martin (*op. cit.*, p. 700) et rapproché de *LF* XLI (369).

[139] Voir M. Alexandre (1996) et A. Dihle, Das Gewand des Einsiedlers Antonius, *JbAC* 22, 1979, 22-29.

[140] C'est Antoine qui parle.

d'Athanase, soucieux de se concilier l'appui des moines,[141] établit entre les deux hommes un lien ancien, et un lien de réciprocité: Antoine ne fait pas que donner et Athanase que recevoir; ils sont, de ce point de vue, sur le même plan et l'on peut rapprocher ce détail de la présentation générale des rapports d'Antoine et des clercs au chapitre 67: prêt à leur dispenser son *ôpheleia* s'ils le lui demandaient, Antoine ne rougissait pas de les interroger à son tour et de reconnaître leur *ôpheleia* (67.2-3); ils sont bien les seuls pour lesquels l'utilité d'Antoine ne soit pas unilatérale. Le moine ne dépasse pas les clercs.

Ayant ainsi évité jusqu'au dernier souffle du moine qu'il apparaisse supérieur à l'évêque, Athanase peut, dans ce jeu d'équilibre délicat qui marque la fin de la *Vita*, exploiter, après sa mort, le prestige du saint qui a rejoint les Pères. Les héritiers alors ne se distinguent plus[142] et chacun βλέπων αὐτὰ (les mélotes) ὡς Ἀντώνιόν ἐστι θεωρῶν· καὶ παραβαλλόμενος δὲ αὐτὰ, ὡς τὰς νουθεσίας αὐτοῦ βαστάζων ἐστὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς (92.3). On retrouve l'attitude initiale d'Athanase dans le prologue, communiant avec les moines dans une même admiration du "bienheureux,"[143] répondant avec zèle à leurs sollicitations et proclamant que "pour (lui) aussi c'était un trésor d'utilité que de simplement (se) souvenir d'Antoine."

D'une certaine manière, Antoine est ainsi plus grand mort que vivant, car désormais celui qui voulait être caché est révélé par Dieu à tous comme un flambeau (93.6) et l'instrument de Dieu pour cette *anadeixis*, c'est Athanase.[144] C'est à lui qu'il appartient de se faire le porteur de la parole d'Antoine, à sa biographie qu'il revient de le glorifier; c'est la *Vita* qui manifeste l'immortalité du saint, qui constitue son véritable culte. La chose est rendue sensible par l'emploi du verbe *kryptein*, "cacher," mais aussi "ensevelir." Attaquant les rites égyptiens, Antoine insiste pour qu'on "cache"

---

[141] C'est ce qu'indique *passim* A. Martin; D. Brakke y consacre le chapitre 2 (The Desert Fathers and the Episcopate, pp. 80-140) de son étude.

[142] Encore que le texte soit très curieux, car s'il commence bien par "chacun de ceux qui ont reçu une mélote du bienheureux Antoine," on lit ensuite "et le manteau qu'il avait usé"; or ce n'est pas "chacun" qui l'a reçu, mais Athanase, qui ainsi tout à la fois se cache et se met en avant.

[143] Athanase emploie l'adjectif *makarios* dans les deux passages (Prol. 2 et 92.3), ce qui est naturel pour un défunt (*cf.* L. Delehaye, *Sanctus*, Bruxelles, 1927, 70-71); on le trouve aussi de son vivant au moment où est signalée sa qualité exceptionnelle de *theodidaktos* (66.2).

[144] Il reprend, pour cette mission du moins, le rôle d'Antoine.

(*i.e.* ensevelisse) son corps,[145] voeu qui semble dans la continuité de sa vie "cachée sur la montagne" (93.5); mais si le corps doit en effet rester caché jusqu'au jour de la résurrection et ne pas donner lieu à un culte déplacé, la *politeia*, elle, doit être diffusée. Tout juste l'écriture peut-elle préfigurer le moment où "il retrouvera son corps incorruptible":[146] telle est l'impression que l'on tire du dernier portrait d'Antoine, situé *après* sa mort, et qui ne parle pourtant que de son corps,[147] insistant sur sa parfaite intégrité physique en dépit de son grand âge.[148]

Mais plus encore qu'à la résurrection lointaine, le texte s'attache à la survie immédiate de l'exemple et de la prédication du saint et, dans sa structure même, passe en quelque sorte le relais à Athanase. La séquence de la mort peut ainsi se décomposer en trois temps, qui, selon le style caractéristique de la *Vita*, font une large place au discursif:[149] des deux premiers chapitres, où Antoine annonce aux moines de la montagne extérieure sa fin prochaine, le premier (89), avec un mélange des styles direct et indirect, prodigue encouragements à l'ascèse et à la défense de l'orthodoxie, tandis que le second (90) rappelle, sur le mode itératif, ses leçons sur les rites funéraires. Les deux chapitres suivants se situent à la montagne intérieure, où le moine est retourné pour mourir "en son lieu" et le premier (91) à nouveau donne la parole à Antoine dans un ultime style direct; c'est son testament, où il reprend les trois thèmes: persévérance dans l'ascèse (§ 2-3); fidélité à l'orthodoxie (§ 4-5); rites funéraires à observer pour lui (§ 6-7), avant d'ajouter, en codicille, les legs aux évêques et aux moines (§ 8-9); puis le chapitre 92 montre sa mort, son enterrement et évoque ses héritiers.[150] Mais il y a encore deux chapitres après cela, dont le premier (93), en une sorte d'ultime oraison funèbre, associe au portrait déjà mentionné, l'affirmation de la gloire que lui a donnée Dieu,[151] tandis que le second (94) constitue une sorte d'"envoi," où Athanase recommande aux

---

[145] 90.2, 4, 5, 6; 91.7; la chose est réalisée en 92.2.

[146] Selon les termes d'Antoine en 91.8 (*cf.* aussi 16.8).

[147] 93.1: alors que le portrait du chapitre 67 n'évoque que le rayonnement et la sérénité tandis que celui du chapitre 14 traite à la fois du corps et de l'âme.

[148] Cette conservation exceptionnelle l'inscrit dans la lignée d'un Moïse, comme l'a montré M. Alexandre (1984).

[149] Voir M. Alexandre (1996), pp. 68-69.

[150] Les deux chapitres se concluent ainsi sur le même sujet (91.8-9//92.3).

[151] Au moyen d'une question rhétorique qui suppose un "orateur" pour la poser (93.5).

moines de se lire et de lire aux païens la *Vie d'Antoine*: et donc, tout naturellement, après les deux ultimes discours du moine, c'est l'évêque, qui, sans solution de continuité, reprend la parole, transmettant aux moines sa catéchèse et montrant aux païens, selon une citation de Luc répétée en son temps par Antoine,[152] que "les chrétiens . . . foulent aux pieds" leurs faux dieux.

Antoine donné en exemple aux moines et montrant aux païens le pouvoir reçu du Christ par les chrétiens: la conclusion associe les deux points de vue qu'Athanase a si bien su imbriquer tout au long de son texte, l'aventure spirituelle personnelle d'un chrétien exemplaire et l'histoire de la chrétienté. Ainsi le combat contre les démons, qui forme la substance de l'effort ascétique, est le combat de tout chrétien, de toute l'Église en butte à un adversaire multiforme; si aux démons tentateurs, le solitaire oppose ascèse, jeûne et prière, contre les démons ariens, le Père des moines a l'arme de la catéchèse et contre les démons païens, suivant les époques, celle du martyre ou de l'apologétique. Mais ce combat est, ou sera, nécessairement victorieux grâce à la victoire du Christ. Sous la plume du dignitaire ecclésiastique, qui a pris à charge non seulement de décrire la *politeia* d'Antoine, mais d'établir la vérité dans les récits qui circulent sur lui (Prol. 2), la catéchèse sur la manière la plus pure de vivre sa foi se double d'une réflexion sur le pouvoir, ou plutôt le*s* pouvoir*s*. Le texte se mue ainsi en glorification de la toute-puissance de Dieu, devant laquelle doit s'incliner le pouvoir temporel des empereurs ou des juges et que manifestent, chacun à sa manière, le moine et l'évêque. Dépourvu de son vivant des pouvoirs thaumaturgiques des païens et *a fortiori* après sa mort de cette puissance miraculeuse que les Mélétiens attribuaient aux reliques, le moine n'est pas un homme de pouvoir, tout juste une autorité morale mise au service de l'Eglise par l'évêque en ces sombres heures d'exil, où, tout autant que le moine, il pouvait se redire -et espérer-: "C'est quand je suis faible que je suis fort."

F-75012 Paris, 4, rue Louis Braille

---

[152] 24.5 et 30.3.

* Cet article doit beaucoup à Olivier Munnich et aux longues conversations que nous avons eues sur la *Vita*. Qu'il trouve ici l'expression de ma gratitude et de mon amitié.

GREGORY OF NYSSA'S TERMINOLOGY FOR TRINITARIAN PERICHORESIS

BY

DANIEL F. STRAMARA JR.

The first Father to employ the term περιχώρησις in a theological sense was a Cappadocian, Gregory of Nazianzus, when speaking of the titles of Christ with regard to his humanity and divinity.[1] The term is originally a Stoic one meaning "interpenetration."[2] Also connected with it is the meaning of rotation.[3] Although Gregory of Nyssa does not use the noun, he employs the verb five times.[4] In every case save one,[5] it is used in conjunction with the word κύκλος, in the context of the cycle of life. While the bishop of Nyssa does not utilize the verb to elucidate the interpenetration of the Divine Persons or the circular movement operative within their midst, the theology is present all the same. He does, however, make use of two terms which are very evocative—περιφέρω and ἀνακύκλησις; these shall be studied below. Notwithstanding, for the sake of theological facility, following both Kelly and Frend,[6] I will purposely employ the anachronistic term "peri-

[1] See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistula* 101.6; SC 208:38.

[2] See Verna Harrison, "Perichoresis in the Greek Fathers," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 35 (1991): 53-65; Peter Stemmer, "Perichorese. Zur Geschichte eines Begriffs," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 27 (1983): 9-55; and Harry A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 1:418-28.

[3] See G.L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1964), 282-300; Julian Stead, "Perichoresis in the Christological Chapters of the *De Trinitate* of Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria," *Dominican Studies* 6 (1953): 12-20; and Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1077-78.

[4] See Gregory of Nyssa, *Apologia in hexaemeron*, PG 44:96A & 108B; *Contra Eunomium* 1.10, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* henceforth GNO 1 54,24; *De anima et resurrectione*, PG 46:113B; and *Oratio funebris in Flacillam imperatricem*, GNO 9 485,5.

[5] See Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 1.10, GNO 1 54,24; trans. by H.A. Wilson, *Against Eunomius* in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* Second Series Volume 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), 45; henceforth NPNF 2.5:45 etc.

[6] See J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* 5th revised edition (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1975), 264 where he sees Letter 38.8 as testimony to the doctrine of perichoresis in Gregory's theology. Frend states, "Theology owes to him [Gregory of Nyssa]

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

choresis" when discussing the interpenetration or coinherence of the Persons in Gregory's trinitarian theology.[7] (The first author to apply the term perichoresis in trinitarian sense was Pseudo-Cyril sometime between 657-681.[8] John of Damascus later gave official approbation to the term in this context.[9])

Perhaps the primary reason why Gregory of Nyssa never borrows the term περιχώρησις, is the physical connotation of the Stoic usage. The term refers to the admixture of material elements. God, inasmuch as God is essence, is a *spiritual* "substance." Gregory taunts Eunomius,

> Surely no one is such a child in understanding so as mentally to superimpose concepts of spatial differentiation upon intellectual and incorporeal nature, for position in space is proper to bodies, whereas what is intellectual and immaterial by nature is recognized to be far outside the domain of spatial concepts.[10]

Consequently, the Persons are "mutually inclusive (ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἀμφότερα)."[11] They exist in one another. Of course, this thought is thoroughly Johannine and Gregory cites John 10:38 and 17:21 on numerous occasions.[12]

What is of interest, is his application of the verses. John 10:38 becomes a handy weapon in Gregory's arsenal against Eunomius. The Son's dwelling in the Father and the Father in the Son substantiates the Son's eternity.[13] It likewise proves the Son never had, nor ever will have, any share in non-

---

the concept of 'coinherence,'" (W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984], 640).

[7] Even though ἀντιπαρέκτασις is the Stoic term for "mutual coextension" built on the form ἔκτασις (fondly used by Gregory especially in ἐπέκτασις), Gregory never employs the term to refer to the mutual indwelling of the Persons in one another. The Stoic Alexander of Aphrodisias informs us that Chrysippus used the term in connection with the verb χωρέω; see Wolfson, *Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, 411-19.

[8] See Pseudo-Cyril, *De Trinitate* 10, PG 77:1144B. For background information see B. Fraigneau-Julien, "Un traité anonyme de la Sainte Trinité attribué à s. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 49 (1961), 188-211 & 386-405; for the dating see p. 402.

[9] See John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 1.8, PG 94:829A.

[10] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 1.15 GNO 1 76,19-23; my translation. All translations are mine.

[11] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 3.5 (CE 7.3), GNO 2 177,3.

[12] For John 10:38 see *Contra Eunomium*, GNO 1 209,6; GNO 2 208,7; 230,20; 233,26; 269,13; 322,26; and *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* 12, GNO 3.1 82,23-24. For John 17:21 see *Contra Eunomium*, GNO 1 208:17; *In illud: Tunc et ipse filius*, GNO 3.2 22,18-20; and *In Canticum Canticorum* 15, GNO 6 467,3-5.

[13] See Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 3.7 (CE 9.3), GNO 2 230,15-23; NPNF 2.5:216.

existence.[14] The Persons contain each other fully; "clearly, the One in his entirety, entirely in the Other; the Father not superabounding in the Son, nor the Son diminishing in the Father."[15] No one Person is outside the other. Here the reader is confronted with a paradox:[16] each Person is both contained and containing.[17] Gregory believes this mystery was prophesied by Isaiah:[18] "'God dwells within You, and there is no God beside You; for You are God.' For what other God exists who has God dwelling within Himself, and is Himself God, except the Only-begotten?"[19]

This coinherence, this mutual inclusivity, testifies to the oneness of God. Nevertheless, each is in the other according to his own particular relational vantage point, or "subjectivity." Gregory explains,

> "I am in the Father and the Father is in me," each being said, of course, to be in the other from a different point of view: the Son in the Father, as the beauty of the replica is in the archetypal form, and the Father in the Son, as the beauty of the prototype is in the replica.[20]

The perichoresis does not vitiate the respective individuality and incommunicability of each Person.[21] A few paragraphs before, Gregory had defended the Son's eternal existence.

> The designation "Father" equally includes in itself the predication of the two Persons (προσώπων), for the notion of offspring automatically follows with this appellation. When did the Son not exist? In what can his non-existence be

---

[14] See Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 3.7 (CE 9.4), GNO 2 233,23-234,3; NPNF 2.5:218.

[15] Gregory of Nyssa, *Refutatio confessionis Eunomii*, (CE 2.4), GNO 2 322,27-323,2. See also Gregory of Nyssa (Basil), *Epistula* 38.8.

[16] For the role of paradox in Gregory of Nyssa's theology see my dissertation "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον: Prosopon as Person in the Works of Gregory of Nyssa" (Ph.D. diss., Saint Louis University, 1996), 327-29.

[17] See Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* 12, GNO 3.1 82,25-84,3.

[18] This, of course, is with the aid of the "inspired" translators of the Septuagint text of Isaiah 45:15.

[19] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 3.9 (CE 11.2), GNO 2 269,11-14.

[20] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 1.39, GNO 1 209, 6-11.

[21] For the individuality and incommunicability of the Divine Persons see chapter four of my dissertation. As John of Damascus centuries later reiterates, "The abiding and resting of the Persons in one another is not in such a manner that they coalesce or become confused, but, rather, so that they adhere to one another, for they are without interval between them and inseparable and their mutual indwelling is without confusion," *De fide orthodoxa* 1.14, PG 94:859B; trans. by Frederic H. Chase, Jr., *Orthodox Faith* in *Fathers of the Church* volume 37 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1958), 202.

> comprehended? In a place?—there was no place. In time?—the Lord is before time. If then he exists before these, when was he not? And if he was in the Father, in what was he not?[22]

The term "Father" is a relational term; it is personal. The term πρόσωπον is likewise relational; it is directional: towards the face of another.[23] The "direction" of the Father with regard to the Son and vice versa is supplied by Scripture: they are in each other. Their very existences are inextricably intertwined.

In his debate with Eunomius, Gregory was forced into dealing primarily with the Son's relationship with the Father.[24] The previous quotes overlook the Spirit's involvement in the divine circumincession. However, in his contentions with the Macedonians, Gregory needed to address the Spirit's place in the divinity. He beautifully writes,

> You see the revolving circle (ἐγκύκλιον) of the glory moving round (περιφοράν) from Like to Like. The Son is glorified by the Spirit; the Father is glorified by the Son; again the Son possesses glory from the Father; and the Only-begotten becomes the glory of the Spirit. For with what shall the Father be glorified, if not with the true glory of the Only-begotten; and again with what shall the Son be glorified, if not with the majesty of the Spirit? In like manner, again, the relation (λόγος) completes the circle (ἀνακυκλούμενος), and glorifies the Son by means of the Spirit, and the Father by means of the Son.[25]

While this rich text does not explicitly state that the One is in the Other, Gregory had just mentioned how the Spirit searches the depths of God and is never apart from the Holy Trinity. Gregory likewise demonstrated how the Three are intimately interconnected.[26] Thus the Three together form one circle of glorious divinity.

Their relationships are not static but "revolve around" one another. The glory, the loving praise which they share and bestow upon one another, is "*peripheretic*," if I may coin a word. The verb means to carry around or whirl about.[27] While Gregory does not employ the verb περιχωρέω in a

---

[22] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 1.39, GNO 1 208,11-17.

[23] For the meaning of *prosōpon* in Gregory's works see my dissertation.

[24] This is not to imply that the Holy Spirit was not a matter of discussion between Eunomius and Gregory; rather, Eunomius primarily focused on the "Unbegotten" and the "begotten." Consequently, Gregory's two works against Eunomius are conditioned by the debate.

[25] Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Macedonianos*, GNO 3.1 109,7-15.

[26] See Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Macedonianos*, GNO 3.1 106,25-107.2.

[27] For the meaning of "swinging about," "wheeling around," and "turning round/making dizzy," see LSJ.

trinitarian manner, he does utilize the verb περιφέρω to capture the dynamic relationship among the Persons. Wherefore instead of perichoresis, one might properly speak of a *peripheresis* operating in Gregory's trinitarian theology. The Persons whirl "about" each other and inside of each other.[28] The depiction is one of mutual admiration, each Person "falling all over" the other, glorying in the other.[29] In a sense, the Persons are continually "falling in love."[30]

Authentic love disposes persons to be "mutually inclusive (ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἀμφότερα)." Such a love is celebrated in the Song of Songs between Christ, the bridegroom, and his beloved church. Gregory underscores that this love poem "contains the passionate affection of two lovers who bestow upon each other their mutual love (παρ' ἀμφοτέρων ἀλλήλοις)."[31] Naturally, such a vitality is experienced among the Divine Persons to the greatest degree.[32]

Not only is the trinitarian glory encyclic, revolving, it is likewise "*anacyclic*," resumptively encompassing.[33] Gregory employs the same term in another discussion of the Trinitarian Persons. In, *On Not Three Gods*, Gregory clarifies,

> If anyone should raise trivial objections to our argument that by refusing to acknowledge distinctions in the nature it leads to an admixture and intermingling (ἀνακύκλησιν) of the Persons (ὑποστάσεων), we shall supply the following answer to such a charge. Although we acknowledge the indistinguishable character of the nature, we do not deny a distinction with respect to causality.[34]

---

[28] It is not surprising then that Gregory says trying to understand God makes a person dizzy; see Gregory of Nyssa, (Basil) *Epistula* 38.5 in connection with 38.8; as well as *De beatitudinibus* 6, GNO 7.2 137,10 & 25, 138,26; and *In Ecclestiasten* 7, GNO 5 414,5.

[29] In the above excerpt Gregory does not say that the Spirit is "glorified," yet a few lines earlier he had emphasized this; see *Adversus Macedonianos*, GNO 3.1 108,28-32. Thus the peripheresis is in fact complete.

[30] See Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione*, PG 46:96B-C.

[31] Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum* 9, GNO 6 264,3-5. See also *Vita S. Macrinae* 5, GNO 8.1 376,7-8 wherein Gregory lauds the ἀντίδοσίς τις ἀγαθὴ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων ἀλλήλαις ἀντιπληρουμένη between Macrina and her mother. Love engenders mutual reciprocity.

[32] See Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum* 15, GNO 6 466,5-469,9 where Gregory brings his commentary to a climax with the effusive love shared between the Holy Spirit and Christ in which the Church is ultimately caught up.

[33] See LSJ and Lampe.

[34] Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium*, GNO 3.1 55,21-56,2.

Lampe cites only this text as a witness to ἀνακύκλησις, providing the meaning of "interchange." In this passage it alludes to a circular intermingling.[35] (Unfortunately, both Wilson and Richardson translate ἀνακύκλησιν as "confusion" which is unwarranted.)[36] Note that Gregory does not reject the dynamic of intermingling as operative within God; he merely claims that this circular commingling does not destroy the distinction of the Persons. In his *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, Gregory uses the same word to refer to the resumptive circuit of the sun and then applies it to πνεῦμα in general, which likewise takes a circular route.[37] Accordingly, the "*anacyclesis*" (ἀνακύκλησις) of the Trinitarian Persons, the perpetually resumptive and circular intermingling in the Other *ad intra*, is the theological dynamic behind the recapitulation (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις), resumptive summing up, of all things *ad extra*, operative in the one πρόσωπον of Christ.[38] Gregory states, "Christ put on our full human nature as the first fruits of the dough which included a part of each race: Jew, Samaritan, Greek and all humanity."[39] The person of Christ is resumptively inclusive.[40] For this "Father of the Fathers'"[41] circular return is a natural dynamic of God's being; God is not static.

This is alluded to in another passage. According to Gregory, creation itself reflects Divine Nature. when the Only-begotten made creation, "at that time, with the body of heaven and by means of the circumambient essence (κυκλοφορουμένης οὐσίας), he surrounded that whole universe which is measured off within its compass."[42] This created "circumambient essence"

---

[35] Elsewhere Gregory uses the noun to refer to the cyclical nature of time and the seasons. See *De iis qui baptismum differunt*, PG 46:416C; *De tridui spatio*, GNO 9 296,10; *In Ecclesiasten* 7, GNO 5 392,18; and *In inscriptiones Psalmorum* 2.5, GNO 5 83,24.

[36] See Henry Austin Wilson, *On Not Three Gods*; NPNF 2.5:336 and Cyril C. Richardson, *An Answer to Ablabius* in *The Library of Christian Classics Volume III: Christology of the Later Fathers* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 266.

[37] See Gregory of Nyssa, *In Ecclesiasten* 1, GNO 5 287,16-288,4.

[38] See chapter five of my dissertation.

[39] Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum* 14, GNO 6 427,21-428,2. See also *Oratio catechetica magna* 30, Srawley Gk 112,1-8.

[40] For Gregory, human life itself organically recapitulates lower life-forms; see Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione*, PG 46:60B; *De hominis opificio* 29.6-8, PG 44:237A-C; and Jean Daniélou, *Grégoire de Nysee: Création de l'homme, Sources chrétiennes*, vol. 6 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1944), 36.

[41] See Nicaea II, *Actio Sexta, Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Mansi 13:293E, (Paris, 1902).

[42] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 3.7 (CE 9.1), GNO 2 216,23-25. See Wilson's translation in NPNF 2.5:211.

is the perpetually rotating spherical structure encircling the cosmos as envisioned by the ancients. All the same, because created being mirrors the Uncreated, for Gregory, God, *anagogically*, is a κυκλοφορουμένη οὐσία, circulatory Being.[43]

Thus while Gregory does not use the word perichoresis, he explicitly employs two other equally evocative and dynamic terms: *peripheresis* and *anacyclesis*, as well as one which is implicit: *cyclophoroumene*. To synthesize Gregory's imagery and conceptions throughout his works, one could validly say that the Father embosoms the Son and envelops the Spirit within Himself; the Son enthrones the Father and enfolds the Spirit within Himself; and the Spirit enshrines the Father and encompasses the Son within Himself. Each participates in the utterfullness of mutual inclusivity and co-extensive existence. "Therefore, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are to be acknowledged only in a perfect Trinity, in closest connection and union with each other (μετ' ἀλλήλων)."[44] The Divine Persons are inextricably intertwined.

Appropriately, the perichoresis is the basis for the believer's experience of the indwelling Trinity. Gregory notes that the Only-begotten says to the soul which thirsts and hungers for the divine presence: "I and the Father will come and we will make our abode with him (of course, the Holy Spirit had already been dwelling there) [Gregory's own parenthetical remark]."[45] The entire Trinity ushers the believer into the depths of their communitarian life and shares the fullness of this fellowship within the believer's heart. Gregory celebrates the unending circle of God's vitality and the dynamic vibrancy of trinitarian love.

Although this "Father of the Fathers" does not employ the word perichoresis in a trinitarian sense, he avails himself of two other terms—περιφέρω and ἀνακύκλησις—to depict the dynamic of trinitarian vitality and incessant intercommunion.

Rockhurst College, *Kansas City*, MO 64110 USA

---

[43] Perhaps Gregory's remark, "Here we have a very great paradox: motion and stability are the same," (*De vita Moysis* 2.243, GNO 7.1 118,3-4) can be applied to the mystery of the divine vitality; the original context is a human person's participation in God's life.

[44] Gregory of Nyssa. *Adversus Macedonianos*, GNO 3.1 98,28-30.

[45] Gregory of Nyssa, *De beatitudinibus* 4, GNO 7.2 122,23-25.

OPUS IMPERFECTUM
AUGUSTINE AND HIS READERS, 426-435 A.D.

BY

MARK VESSEY

> On the fifth day before the Kalends of September [in the thirteenth consulship of the emperor Theodosius II and the third of Valentinian III], departed this life the bishop Aurelius Augustinus, most excellent in all things, who at the very end of his days, amid the assaults of besieging Vandals, was replying to the books of Julian and persevering gloriously in the defence of Christian grace.[1]

The heroic vision of Augustine's last days was destined to a long life. Projected soon after his death in the *Chronicle* of Prosper of Aquitaine, reproduced in the legendary biographies of the Middle Ages, it has shaped the ultimate or penultimate chapter of more than one modern narrative of the saint's career.[2] And no wonder. There is something very compelling about the picture of the aged bishop recumbent against the double onslaught of the heretical monster Julian and an advancing Vandal army, the extremity of his plight and writerly perseverance enciphering once more the unfathomable mystery of grace and the disproportion of human and divine enterprises. In the chronicles of the earthly city, the record of an *opus magnum sed imperfectum*; in the numberless annals of eternity, the perfection of God's work in and through his servant Augustine. . . .

As it turned out, few observers at the time were able to abide by this providential *explicit* and Prosper, despite his zeal for combining chronicle

---

[1] Prosper, *Epitoma chronicon*, a. 430 (ed. Mommsen, MGH, AA 9, 473).

[2] E.g., Joseph McCabe, *Saint Augustine and His Age* (London 1902) 427: "Whilst the Vandals thundered at the walls Augustine was absorbed in his great refutation of the Pelagian bishop of Eclanum, Julian." Other popular biographers prefer the penitential vision of Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 31,1-2. On the modern *scholarly* representation of Augustine's last days, see James J. O'Donnell, "The Next Life of Augustine," in *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture*, eds. William E. Klingshirn and Mark Vessey (forthcoming), referring to the classic work of P.R.L. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London 1967).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998 *Vigiliae Christianae* 52, 264-285

and theology,[3] was not among them. For those active in the textual dissemination of Christian dogma, Augustine's death was an epochmaking event. For the West, it marked the end of one of the most decisive literary and doctrinal careers since St. Paul's and the beginning of a period of corresponding theological uncertainty. We should not suppose, however, that Augustine's contemporaries were caught entirely unprepared when he died. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that the critical importance of this writer's death had been recognized well in advance of the event, and by no-one more clear-sightedly than the writer himself.

The portrait of Augustine as an old man looking back has been memorably drawn by Peter Brown.[4] My concern here is rather with Augustine as an old man looking forward, not to the vision of God he had long desired, but to the future circumstances of his fellow Christians, especially Christian readers, in *this* world, he himself having left it. How did Augustine and those under his influence prepare for the "post-Augustinian" era in Latin Christian literature? To what extent did his later writings, and the commissions he received, take account of the imminent demise of the author? How did his readers, sympathetic or critical, adjust to the new reality of his now never-to-be-extended literary oeuvre? How, in turn, did they begin to adjust that oeuvre to their own ends? The present essay follows a trail of readerly reactions to and constructions of the *opus Augustinianum* through the late 420s and into the early 430s, beginning with Augustine's own.[5]

The acts of an extraordinary meeting of the clergy and people in the *Basilica Pacis* at Hippo in September 426 record the bishop's appointment of the presbyter Eraclius to serve as his eventual successor and, in the

---

[3] Cf. RA. Markus, "Chronicle and Theology: Prosper of Aquitaine," in *The Inheritance of Historiography*, eds. C. Holdsworth and T.P. Wiseman (Exeter 1986) 31-43, repr. in his *Sacred and Secular: Studies on Augustine and Latin Christianity* (Aldershot 1994). Prosper's *Chronicle* is remarkable for its incorporation of notices derived from Augustine's catalogue of heresies, the *De haeresibus*, the last chapter of which describes the errors of the Pelagians. The next entry in the *Chronicle* after the record of Augustine's death refers to the Council of Ephesus at which "Nestorius with the heresy named after him, and many Pelagians, who were supporting a dogma related to their own, [were] condemned."

[4] *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London 1967) 408 ff.

[5] The omission of Possidius I shall make good elsewhere; see, meanwhile, my "Conference and Confession: Literary Pragmatics in Augustine's 'Apologia contra Hieronymum'," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993) 175-213 at 175-179, where I suggest that "Possidius' simplified and systematized account of the principles of Augustinian *doctrina* can serve as a basis for theorizing Christian literary activity in late antiquity" (177).

meantime, as his *locum tenens* for the conduct of routine diocesan affairs. It was an arrangement Augustine had tried unsuccessfully to implement some years earlier, and on which he now insisted. Henceforward, for at least five days of every seven, Eraclius would handle pastoral and judicial matters, leaving the bishop free for intellectual labor. "Let no-one envy me my leisure," Augustine told the assembled company, "for it is full of business."[6]

Medieval hagiographers not unreasonably supposed that Augustine's hard-won sabbatical was to be spent on the *Retractationes*. Had he been left to his own devices, it is possible that more of it would have been devoted to that task, and that we should now have the revisions of his letters and sermons as well as of the major books. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to regard all Augustine's other literary undertakings of those last four years as distractions from the main task of reviewing his past production. As a work that anticipates the objections of critics and seeks to impose criteria for the subsequent reception of his oeuvre, the *Retractations* is the most obviously "pre-posthumous" of Augustine's later writings. But it is by no means the only text of this period that both inscribes and, as it were, preemptively overwrites the death of the author. Its twin guiding principles—that Augustine's works should be read with an eye to their original order and context, and that the reader's understanding should advance with (and beyond) the author's[7]—are implicit in much else that he wrote around that time, as indeed they already are in much that he had written earlier. Even if we set aside the *De civitate Dei* (begun in 412, but not completed until 426/7), itself a massive work of recapitulation and revision, there remain the "second edition" of the *De doctrina christiana* (complete in four books), the projected two books *De haeresibus*, and the *Speculum*, all works which—with the somewhat earlier *Enchiridion*—may be seen as interlocking members of a textual bridge designed to carry Latin readers over the rift between the *saeculum Augustinianum* and the succeeding age.[8] Some of Augustine's later "anti-Pelagian" writings, I suggest, may also usefully be viewed in this perspective. Whereas the tracts against Julian, written at a rhythm dictated by the latter, retain to the last the air of business the author would finish

---

[6] Augustine, *Ep.* 213,6 (CSEL 57,378).

[7] Note especially *Retr.* 1, prol. 3 (CCSL 57,6): "quicumque ista lecturi sunt, non me imitentur errantem, sed in melius proficientem. Inveniet enim fortasse quomodo scribendo profecerim, quisquis opuscula mea ordine quo scripta sunt legerit. Quod ut possit, hoc opere quantum potero curabo, ut eundem ordinem noverit."

[8] Othmar Perler, *Les voyages de saint Augustin* (Paris 1969) 361 ff., with the table, 472-477, provides a detailed chronology.

if he could and then have die with him, another, less polemical set of treatises seems aimed at a readerly community for which he would make long-term provision. It is with those works and their readers that the following pages are mainly concerned.

Florus of Hadrumetum: The Reader and the Author

Shortly before Easter 426 a little embassy of monks from Hadrumetum arrived in Hippo on urgent business to the bishop.[9] Their monastery was in uproar. On a recent visit to Uzalis, one of the brethren, Florus, had made a copy of an anti-Pelagian treatise ascribed to Augustine and sent it back to the community. As some of the monks construed it, the argument of this work left no room for free will in the actions for which human beings were divinely judged. They were outraged. Surely, they said, Augustine had never held such a doctrine; the work could not be his. On his return Florus had staunchly upheld what he took to be the author's position. Tempers flared. An alarmed abbot called on local experts for help. Evodius, bishop of Uzalis, replied in a short letter urging prayerful reflection and a broadly Augustinian theology of grace. A presbyter named Januarianus wrote more punctiliously to the same effect. Another, Sabinus, appeared in person to interpret the controversial treatise.[10] All to no avail. The champions of free will insisted on taking the matter up with Augustine himself. Scarcely knowing what to do or think, still less what to write to the bishop of Hippo, the abbot had finally let two of them go.

Events such as these reveal the long-term hazards of the propaganda campaign mounted a decade earlier by Augustine and his allies against Pelagius, Caelestius, and their party. That "Great War" now belonged to

---

[9] For the theological issues involved in this and subsequent phases of the so-called "semi-Pelagian" controversy, see now Rebecca Harden Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*, NAPS Patristic Monograph Series 15 (Macon [Georgia] 1996). A summary account may also be found in Dunstan O'Keefe, "The *Via Media* of Monastic Thelogy," *Downside Review* 112 (1994) 264-283, 113 (1995) 54-73, 157-174. My narrative for this section is based on Augustine, *Epp.* 214-216 (including 215A, printed as a prefatory addendum to Goldbacher's edition in CSEL 58). *Ep.* 217, to Vitalis, is further evidence of the author's concern for the proper reception of his works: "[R]ogavi deum et . . . adhuc rogo," it begins, "ut litteras meas nec aspernanter sumas et salubriter legas" (CSEL 57,403).

[10] *Ep.* 216,3 (CSEL 57,398). The letters of Evodius and Januarianus are printed in PLS 2,331-341.

history,[11] but the textual munitions used to win it and secure a fragile peace still lay scattered around, fused and liable to go off if not handled with care. Veterans of the earlier hostilities, like Evodius, were naturally circumspect. Others less well informed, like the monks of Hadrumetum, risked being hoist by their own reading. In the present case, they needed to know that Augustine's letter of 418 A.D. to the Roman presbyter Sixtus (the text copied by Florus) had been written against those "new heretics," the Pelagians. That is what Augustine told Abbot Valentinus, as he set about making this corner of the war zone safe for non-combatants.

From the outset of his dealings with the African monks, Augustine seems to have grasped the paradigmatic quality of their situation. Others could come to grief as they nearly had, on this or any similarly complex theological question. A single hyperactive reader in a Christian community had brought confusion on the rest, quite possibly through no fault of his own. The visitors from Hadrumetum blamed Florus. The bishop of Hippo suspends judgment: Florus may have failed to understand the text in question (*aut . . . non intellegit librum meum*) or been misunderstood (*aut forte ipse non intellegitur*).[12] We are reminded, not for the last time in documents from the final phase of Augustine's career, of those earlier essays on human understanding and its textual instruments, the *De magistro, De doctrina christiana*, and *De catechizandis rudibus*.[13] The new controversy underlined an old point: that all knowledge of the truth, howsoever mediated, was God-given. Already by the mid-390s Augustine's epistemology had received the imprint of his theory of grace. Thirty years later his message was the same. *Da quod iubes* ("Grant what you command"), the prayer that had scandalized Pelagius when he read the *Confessions*,[14] was as applicable to the intellectual as to the moral life. In the quest for understanding, whether of Augustine's writings or of the Holy Scripture to which all Christian writing was ancillary, the interpreter relied on a human intellect illuminated by God.[15] "Reread

---

[11] Brown, *Augustine*, 399.

[12] Augustine, *Ep.* 214,6 (CSEL 57,385).

[13] Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996), is now the fullest discussion, reviewed at length by James J. O'Donnell and the present writer in *Bryn Mawr Reviews* (on-line) [19]96.9.1-2.

[14] Augustine, *De dono perseverantiae* 20,53 (PL 45,1026), referring to *Conf.* 10,29,40 f.

[15] The point is fundamental to Augustine's sense of his oeuvre as a Christian writer. See already *Ep.* 27,4 (to Paulinus of Nola, 396 A.D.), appositely cited by James J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1992) l.xxxi, and contextualized in my "Conference and Confession" (cited above. n. 5) 188-189.

that book carefully—*repetite assidue librum istum*," Augustine says of his Letter to Sixtus, "and if you understand, give thanks to God. And where you do not understand, pray that you may; for God will give you understanding."[16]

"Read, and pray for understanding" was a piece of advice Eraclius might have offered any puzzled reader of Augustine, without disturbing the bishop's peace. It was the advice Evodius had already given in his letter to Abbot Valentinus.[17] Before long, it would be the only general advice anyone could give. For as long as he lived, however, Augustine continued to strive by every practical means to ensure that the understanding he had been granted by God was available through him—that is, in the majority of cases, through his writings—to others. His first letter to Valentinus is a holding measure; the two itinerant monks wanted to be back in their monastery for Easter and there was no time for him to explain the intricacies of the debate they had blundered into. Or so he thought. Then, as they were about to leave, another of their company arrived, apparently with permission for them to prolong their stay. The letter just written would now be kept, to be sent with a second as part of the covering matter for a new work written specially to deal with the issues raised, entitled *On Grace and Free Will.* And there would be more besides. In the days after Easter, Augustine went over a series of canonical documents with his guests: the letters of the anti-Pelagian councils of Carthage and Milevis (416) and of the five African bishops to Pope Innocent; the latter's replies; the letter of another African council (417) to Pope Zosimus; that pope's *Epistula tractoria* addressed to all the bishops of the Roman Empire; a further statement of the African bishops. All these texts, together with his Letter to Sixtus, a treatise of Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer, and the new work *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, were the objects of a paschal seminar conducted for the benefit of his visitors. In future, they would be available for study by the community at Hadrumetum: *haec omnia et in praesentia legimus cum ipsis et per eos misimus vobis*, Augustine tells the abbot.[18] By a process of collation, contextualization, and supplement

---

[16] Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 24,46 (PL 44,911).

[17] Evodius, *Ep. ad abbatem Valentinum* (PLS 2,333): "Legant ergo sancti Dei maiorum dicta . . . et quando non intellegunt, non cito reprehendant, sed orent ut intellegant, petant ut accipiant, quaerant ut inveniant, pulsent ut aperiatur eis" (cf. Augustine, *Conf.* 13,38,53, with O'Donnell's commentary *ad loc.*). He adds that the will to understand ("velle bene intellegere") is itself God-given, and alludes to the key Augustinian proof-text, 1 Corinthians 4:7. Januarianus toes the same line (PLS 2,341).

[18] Augustine, *Ep.* 215,2 (CSEL 57,389). For identification of the canonical documents, no longer all extant, see Otto Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius: Die theologische Position der*

that was at once archival and authorial, Augustinian and para-Augustinian, the treatise procured by Florus had been securely enmeshed in a larger ensemble, a kind of hypertextual apparatus *de gratia et libero arbitrio* created by Augustine to make intelligible not only the doctrines at issue but also the textual forms in which they had been progressively published. With some adjustments, the method is essentially that of the contemporary *Retractations*.

Even then Augustine did not desist. He asked that Florus be sent to him, and in due course Florus came. Valentinus may have been a little overwhelmed by the library of texts brought home from Hippo, embarrassed too by his earlier reluctance to endorse the Letter to Sixtus. Eager to make amends, he now gave fulsome assurances of the community's fidelity to Augustine's teaching. Florus, who carried the abbot's letter to Hippo, also brought tidings of new dissension in the monastery, perhaps provoked by a cursory reading of the *De gratia et libero arbitrio*. If the fallen human will was powerless for the good until enabled by divine grace, then—it was now being asked—what right had any human being to reprimand another for his moral failings? To that question, so potentially subversive of monastic discipline, Augustine replied in a treatise *De correptione et gratia* ("On Admonition and Grace"), which Florus could have taken back to Hadrumetum in the latter half of 426. The last work listed in the author's *Retractations*, it begins with a summons to readerly *retractatio*. If the monks of Hadrumetum—or, by extension, any future community of readers—wished to derive full profit from the writer's previous work *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, let them read it through again, noting in particular what divine (as opposed to human) authority was adduced in support of its arguments.[19] The logic of this prefatory admonition could hardly be more constraining. To read Augustine right was to discover the sense of God's biblical word . . . and rightly to construe that sense, one should reread Augustine!

---

römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411-32, Päpste und Papsttum 7 (Stuttgart 1975), 147-148.

[19] Augustine, *De correptione et gratia* 1,1 (PL 44,917): "Non itaque opus est omnia identidem retractare, quae sufficienter vobis pleno libro disputata transmisimus [i.e., the *De gratia et libero arbitrio*] quem quomodo susceperitis, rescripta indicant vestra [*Ep.* 216]. Verumtamen semel lectum nullo modo arbitremini satis vohis innotescere potuisse. Si ergo fructuosissimum habere vultis, non vos pigeat relegendo habere notissimum, ut diligentissime sciatis quibus et qualibus quaestionibus solvendis atque sanandis, non ibi humana sed divina occurrat auctoritas, a qua recedere non debemus, si volumus pervenire quo tendimus."

Contradictory as they may at first appear, Augustine's reminder of the primacy of divine authority and his insistence on the authority of popes and councils as warrants of his own teaching are twin features of a pedagogy adapted to a world in which human discernment can never be perfect but, divinely aided, may nevertheless catch glimmers of a transcendent truth. Convinced that the institutions of the church were part of God's provision for the elect on their earthly pilgrimage, Augustine set a high value on the pronouncements of bishops and other notable Christian teachers. In the course of controversy with the Pelagians, indeed partly in response to their tactics, he had acquired a theory of conciliar authority and a habit of recourse to the quasi-conciliar agreement of accredited Christian writers.[20] These were important developments for Latin theology and Christian literary practice alike. By the mid-420s, to judge from the replies to Abbot Valentinus, awareness of issues of specifically *textual* authority was not uncommon among the better informed members of the African clergy. Evodius warns sternly against calling into question the written works of "holy teachers of the church" and is horrified by the possibility that the monks might reject the decrees of a "plenary" council. Let them recall the scriptural admonition, "Ask your father and he will show you, your elders and they will tell you" (cf. Deuteronomy 32:7).[21] Januarianus uses the same language, referring to unnamed Catholic authors as "holy fathers, most famous and distinguished teachers of the churches of God," and urging Valentinus to reserve their texts for monks fit to read them.[22] Commonplace as such concerns were to become in the decades after the Council of Ephesus

---

[20] After Pierre Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin*, 5th edn. (Paris 1929) and German Martíl, *La tradición en san Agustín a través de la controversia pelagiana* (Madrid 1943), see Karl-Heinrich Lütcke, *"Auctoritas" bei Augustin* (Stuttgart 1968) 142-46; Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* (cited above, n. 18) 264 ff.; Hermann Josef Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche* (Paderborn 1979) 68-102; Giovanni Maschio, "L'argomentazione patristica di s. Agostino nella prima fase della controversia pelagiana," *Augustinianum* 26 (1986) 459-479; Ernst Dassmann, "'Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus' (c. Iul. imp. 4,112). Augustins Helfer im pelagianischen Streit," in *Oecumenica et Patristica: Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*, eds. Damaskinos Papandreou, Wolfgang A. Bienert, and Knut Schäferdiek (Stuttgart 1989) 259-268. Augustine's textual conciliarism reaches its peak in the *Contra Iulianum* of 422 A.D.

[21] (PLS 2,333-334) where the singular "father" (for the biblical plural) refers most naturally to Augustine himself. For an important recurrence of this biblical verse in a related context, see n. 66 below. Not all contemporary readers were so ready to pronounce Augustine a Catholic *tractator*; for a more sceptical stance, see the text cited at n. 89.

[22] (PLS 2,340-341).

(431 A.D.), they are rare enough in Latin documents of this date to deserve notice.[23] While neither Evodius nor Januarianus mentions Augustine by name, both were plainly conscious of his unique authority on the matter in hand and of the new demands that he was laying on Christian readers, even as he sought to make their way smooth.

Prosper of Aquitaine: The Reader and the Work

The *De correptione et gratia* arrived in Southern Gaul with "unlooked-for timeliness," probably no later than 427.[24] In Prosper's view, it should have silenced the local critics of Augustine's teaching. In the event, it seems only to have made them more vocal. These alleged "enemies of grace"—monks and ascetically minded bishops from Marseilles, Arles, and the surrounding region—included some of the bishop of Hippo's most exacting and resourceful readers. Although direct evidence of their textual practices is hard to find, the writings of Prosper supply material for a tentative comparison of their methods and his.[25]

Before calling on Augustine to intervene personally in the Gallic debate, Prosper had been busy on his behalf, selecting from his work and summarizing his arguments for the local audience.[26] If people would only attend

---

[23] Vessey, "The Forging of Orthodoxy in Latin Christian Literature: A Case Study," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996) 495-496.

[24] Prosper, *Ep. ad Augustinum* (= Augustine), *Ep.* 225,2 (CSEL 57,456): "insperata opportunitate." For the date, see Owen Chadwick, "Euladius of Arles," *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1945) 200-205. As noted by RA. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge 1990) 178, Prosper's letter indicates "that some anxiety, perhaps controversy had preceded the arrival of [Augustine's treatise] in Gaul."

[25] This section and the next are designed to complement R.A. Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius: Orthodoxy, Heresy and Conciliation," in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge 1989), 214-234, esp. 217-220. See now also Éric Rebillard, "*Quasi funambuli*: Cassien et la controverse pélagienne sur la perfection," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 40 (1994) 197-210.

[26] Although it is impossible to say how much of Prosper's vast oeuvre as an epitomator of Augustine dates from before 427, we should not assume that he awaited either the author's death or the outbreak of controversy to begin excerpting and adapting his writings. On his Augustinian *Sententiae*, see Rudolf Lorenz, "Der Augustinismus Prospers von Aquitanien," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 73 (1962) 217-252, and Vittorino Grossi, "La recezione 'sentenziale' di Agostino in Prospero di Aquitania: Alle origini delle frasi sentenziali attribuite ad Agostino," in *Traditio Augustiniana: Studien über Augustinus und seine Rezeption*, Festgabe W. Eckermann (Würzburg 1994) 123-40. Further references and discussion in Weaver, *Divine Grace* (above, n. 9) 117-54. For a preliminary treatment of the

to what had been written by this "special patron"[27] of the Catholic faith, he claimed, they would feel the overwhelming force of his biblical teaching.[28] To encourage them to do so, Prosper reproduced what he took to be the inner "form" of the master's discourse in new outward forms,[29] including verse.[30] Aside from Augustine's own preposthumous recasting of his work, these writings of his Gallic disciple are our first clear instance of the "post"-Augustinian elaboration of an *opus Augustinianum.* In devising them, Prosper was as faithful to the author's habits of doctrinal composition as he meant to be to his doctrine of grace. Appealing for a sequel to the *De correptione et gratia*, he affirmed the utility of writing "even what has been written."[31] Augustine was bound to agree. "To write the same things to you does not irk me," he replied, quoting the Apostle (Philipians 3:1).[32] Irksome as it was to see the biblical testimony to God's grace still being resisted, that would not deter him from adding to the store of books and letters he had written on the subject. For who could be sure that God had not ordained *this* text and *these* intermediaries as means of grace to some of the elect?[33]

Inattention to Augustine's texts was hardly a besetting sin of his ascetic critics in Gaul. Although careful not to publish their dissent while he was living, they read him minutely. "There is a rumour," reports Prosper in an epigram, "that a certain person is slandering (*carpere*) the books of the eloquent old man Augustine and composing a work against him."[34] *Carpere*

---

literary method of Prosper's "Augustinianism" in these and other works such as the *Epigrammata* and *Expositio Psalmorum*, see Vessey, "Ideas of Christian Writing in Late Roman Gaul" (unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis 1988) 152-219, partly resumed here.

[27] *Ep. ad Augustinum* 1 (CSEL 57,455).

[28] *Ep. ad Rufinum* 4,5 (PL 51,80A), with a slap at those who covertly opposed his teaching "inter multas collationes," probably an allusion to Cassian and his party. Confirmation of the early date of the *Epistula ad Rufinum* is offered by Françoise Vinel, "Une étape vers l'affirmation du salut universel: Prosper d'Aquitaine: *Lettre à Rufin*," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 90 (1995) 367-395, who finds in it no trace of the *De correptione et gratia.*

[29] Prosper, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 3 (CSEL 57,459): "Et cum contra eos scripta beatitudinis tuae validissimis et innumeris testimoniis divinarum scripturarum instructa proferimus ac secundum formam disputationum tuarum aliquid etiam ipsi, quo concludantur, adstruimus. . . ."

[30] His *Peri achariston* or *Carmen de ingratis* in 1002 hexameters is usually taken to be an early work.

[31] Prosper, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 9 (CSEL 57,468).

[32] Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 1,1 (PL 44,959).

[33] Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 1,2 (PL 44,961).

[34] Prosper, *Epigramma in obtrectatorem Augustini* 1-2 (PL 51,149A). Cf. the plea in an

can mean "to excerpt" and that sense may also be intended here. If at one stage Prosper could complain that the opposing party did not produce the passages it found objectionable,[35] by the time he and a certain Hilary wrote to Augustine the situation was becoming clearer. The Massilians[36] might disagree with the African's theology at certain points, but they were not about to reject his work en bloc. Rather, they hoped to use one Augustinian text to drive out another. Finding in such recent treatises as the *Contra Iulianum* (422) and *De correptione et gratia* a doctrine of predestination which seemed to devalue their own spiritual enterprise, they appealed from them to Augustine's earlier understanding of grace and free will, expressed in works from the period before the Pelagian crisis. Not only were other catholic teachers on their side, they asserted, so was the "more ancient" Augustine.[37]

Augustine's response to this novel kind of "prescription"[38] can be read in his two books *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae* ("On the Predestination of the Saints" and "On the Gift of Perseverance").[39] There are two key points. First, one must consider the context of particular utterances; these Gallic readers needed to know the circumstances in which each of Augustine's works had been written. Secondly, due allowance had to be made for progressive refinements—even for major adjustments—in

---

another such poem, "Quae concepta fovet promat, quae parturit edat" (PL 51,151A), repeated complaints of secret dissent in the *Ep. ad Rufinum*, and the triumphant words of the *Contra collatorem*, 2,1 (PL 51,218A): "Scripta . . . sunt, et auctoris sui editione publicata," referring to Cassian's *Conferences*.

[35] Prosper, *Ep. ad Rufinum* 18,19 (CSEL 51,88B): "proferendo atque explicando libros."

[36] I use this as a blanket term for the Gallic critics of Augustinian predestination, the opinions of whom are said to have been in the air "Massiliae vel etiam aliquibus locis in Gallia" (Hilary, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 2 [CSEL 57,469]). Prosopographical precision is difficult in this matter: for a recent attempt, see Ralph W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastial Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul* (Washington [D.C.] 1989), 122-40, amplified in his "For Specialists Only: The Reception of Augustine and His Teachings in Fifth-Century Gaul," in *Collectanea Augustiniana: Augustine, Presbyter Factus Sum*, eds. Joseph T. Lienhard, Earl C. Muller, and Roland J. Teske (New York 1993), 29-41.

[37] Hilary, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 3 (CSEL 57,471): "hoc non solum aliorum catholicorum testimoniis sed etiam sanctitatis tuae disputatione antiquiore se probare testantur." The works cited for this purpose included Augustine's *Ep.* 102 (ca. 409), the *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula ad Romanos* (394) and the *De libero arbitrio* (388-394/5).

[38] Augustine, *De dono perseverantiae* 11,26 (PL 45,1008): "agebam in libris de libero arbitrio, unde isti nobis praescribendum putant."

[39] Regarded by the original addressee, and presumably by the author, as a single work *De praedestinatione sanctorum*: Prosper, *Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium* praef. (PL 51,187A).

his thought over the years. The challenge of Pelagius had forced Augustine to express himself more clearly on certain issues. Long before that providential event, however, he had come to see the error in his early belief that an individual could initiate his or her own religious conversion by an unaided act of will.[40] Here again, as in the encounter with Florus and his fellows of Hadrumetum, we recognize the literary apologetics of the *Retractations*, a work which Hilary asked to see as soon as it was ready and which, though still incomplete, was evidently sent to Gaul with the two books *De praedestinatione sanctorum* in 428/9.[41] But there is now a new emphasis on the internal logic or economy of the Augustinian "work" as a whole.

Augustine's understanding of the truth had advanced as he wrote. As vigilant readers of his books, the Massilians should be equally careful to learn from his errors and corrections.[42] The point was later twisted by Prosper in a polemical sense,[43] but his opponents' faith in Augustinian "antiquity" was not so easily shaken. Shortly after Augustine's death, Prosper and Hilary obtained an endorsement of his teaching from Pope Celestine.[44] In a letter to the bishop of Marseille and his regional colleagues, the pope urged an end to controversy, recalling that his predecessors in the Roman see had always counted Augustine "among the best masters."[45] Since he omitted, however, to mention any specific works or dogmas, the Massilians were still free to draw a line between the anti-Pelagian positions approved by Innocent and Zosimus, with which they had no quarrel, and the later outworkings of Augustine's doctrine of predestination, which had never received either papal or conciliar sanction.[46] Prosper insisted that the distinction was false. There was nothing in this author's later works that could not be found more or less clearly expressed in his earlier writings against Pelagius. Everything he had written on the subject of grace and free will since ca. 412, if not since 396, had been imbued with the same spirit, shaped by the same inner "form" of discourse. If they admitted the ortho-

---

[40] See especially *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 3,7-4,8; 9,17; *De dono perseverantiae* 9,23; 11,26-12,30; 20,52-21,55.

[41] Hilary, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 10 (CSEL 57,479). Cf. *De dono perseverantiae* 11,27.

[42] Augustine, *De praestinatione sanctorum* 4,8; *De dono perseverantiae* 21,55.

[43] In his *Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium* (PL 51,191B), complaining of those "qui curaverunt omnes sensus ipsius [sc. Augustini] indagare, [sed] noluerunt cum eius eruditione proficere."

[44] Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* (above, n. 18) 246-249.

[45] Celestine, *Ep. ad episcopos Galliarum* ("Apostolici verba") 2,3 (PL 50,530A).

[46] Prosper, *Contra collatorem* 21,3 (PL 51,272B): his adversaries consider the pope's approval to apply only to Augustine's earlier writings.

doxy of the earlier work, as they professed to, then the Massilians had no choice but to accept the later as well.[47] The Augustine whose opinions carried dogmatic authority did not expire prematurely in 418.

Prosper makes this argument at the close of a polemical work *Contra collatorem*, directed against the thirteenth *Conference* (*collatio*) of John Cassian. Because the list of papal supporters which he adduces there runs all the way to Sixtus III, successor to Celestine in July 432, the treatise is usually dated to that year or later. We should note, however, that the passage in question forms a kind of coda to the work, and that another list of authorities included early in the main text mentions no Roman pontiff later than Zosimus.[48] That earlier list draws on a dossier of papal and conciliar decrees against the Pelagians which Prosper seems to have had at his disposal since ca. 426.[49] Already in the *Letter to Rufinus* he referred to decisions of the eastern bishops, of the Roman see, and of the African councils; the "new critics" of Augustine should know that his teaching had been universally approved.[50] The appeal to geographical universality is further strengthened in the poem *De ingratis* ("On the Graceless, or Ungrateful") through references to Bethlehem (Jerome), Constantinople (the patriarch Atticus), Ephesus and Sicily.[51] Prosper is in no doubt about the value of normative documents. "We have the texts," is his cry: *scripta manent*.[52] The main novelty of the *Contra collatorem* lies in the decision to quote documents verbatim, a procedure more fully developed in the pseudo-Celestinian *Chapters on Divine Grace and Free Will*.[53]

---

[47] Prosper, *Contra collatorem* 21,3 (PL 51,273A), rejecting the distinction between *antiquitas* and *novitas* in Augustine's own teaching: "*idem* doctrinae spiritus . . . eadem praedicationis forma." Cf. Georges de Plinval, "Prosper d'Aquitaine interprète de saint Augustin," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 1 (1958) 347: "Il proclame avec force l'unité qui inspire toute l'oeuvre augustinienne." Prosper builds on Augustine's self-defence at *De dono perseverantiae* 21,55.

[48] Prosper, *Contra collatorem* 5,3.

[49] Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* 149 reviews the documentation.

[50] Prosper, *Ep. ad Rufinum* 3,4 (PL 51,79B): "novi censores." Cf. Augustine, *Retr.* 1, prol. 1 (CCSL 57,5): "ut . . . quod me offendit velut censorio stilo denotem." Jerome had already adapted the language of textual criticism to the orthography of Christian doctrine: Vessey, "Forging of Orthodoxy" (above, n. 23).

[51] Prosper, *De ingratis* 33-71, the latter two names designating places from which Pelagian heretics had been expelled.

[52] Prosper, *De ingratis* 84 (PL 51,101A), referring to the acts of an African council.

[53] This compilation of papal texts, associated in the manuscript tradition with the letter of Celestine to the Gallic bishops (above, n. 45), was convincingly attributed to Prosper by D.M. Cappuyns, *Revue Bénédictine* 41 (1929) 156-170.

Our evidence suggests, then, that Prosper launched his campaign *pro Augustino* on the basis of a body of corroborative, para-Augustinian material similar to that deployed by Augustine himself down to ca. 426 (and presumably deriving from Hippo), but was forced by his opponents to develop additional techniques of argument. The direct appeal to Rome ca. 431 and the systematic citation of papal documents in subsequent works may have been inspired in part by the tactical ultramontanism of Augustine's critics.[54] Harder to deflect, indeed never properly addressed by Prosper, was the Massilian claim that Augustine's teaching contradicted a prior "patristic" consensus.[55] Rather than assent to an unfamiliar and uncongenial exegesis of biblical passages on grace and free will, these readers put their faith in an interpretation supported by the writings of reputable Christian authors besides Augustine. Implicit in their style of argument was the assumption that, in every case where certainty mattered, there would emerge a single, commonly held opinion. To establish that opinion textually was the work of another kind of *retractatio* or review.[56] In the treatise addressed to Prosper and Hilary Augustine went to considerable lengths to supply evidence of patristic support for his views and to explain why it was not more abundant, thereby implicitly underlining the principle of textual conciliarism invoked in his earlier writings against Pelagius and Julian.[57] In the process, it seems, he confirmed certain Gallic theologians in a mode of research to which they were already professionally disposed.

Vincent of Lérins: The Reader and the Text

Among the few named adversaries of Prosper was a certain Vincent, deviser of a terrifying digest of purportedly Augustinian dogmas, such as "That God created the greater part of humanity in order that he might work

---

[54] According to the preface to the ps.-Celestinian *capitula*, these critics professed to accept only doctrines "quae sacratissima beati apostoli Petri sedes . . . sanxit et docuit" (PL 51,205A). Cf. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium* 32.

[55] Prosper, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 2 (CSEL 57,455): Augustine's teaching alleged to be "contrarium . . . patrum opinioni et ecclesiastico sensui."

[56] Hilary, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 8 (CSEL 57,477): the Massilians resort to "libri . . . [eorum] quorum est in ecclesia auctoritas"; Prosper, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 8 (CSEL 57,467): "retractatis priorum de hac re opinionibus, paene omnium par invenitur et una sententia."

[57] Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 14,27-28; *De dono perseverantiae* 19,48-50. Prosper's appeal to the "sensus omnium tractatorum" at *Contra collatorem* 9,5 (PL 51,238C) is justified by a single quotation from Ambrose.

their perpetual ruin."[58] On the principle of not multiplying Vincents beyond necessity, this one should be identified with a monk of Lérins who at the same period produced an anti-heretical treatise known as the *Commonitorium*, and a set of excerpts from Augustine's trinitarian and christological writings.[59] Links between the monastic communities of Lérins and Marseilles were close, and there are important methodological and ideological convergences between Cassian's *Conferences* and the *Commonitorium*.[60] Cassian may have refrained from overt disagreement with the bishop of Hippo, but the manner of his claim to offer a (non-Augustinian) doctrine of grace and free will in conformity with the opinions of "all the catholic fathers" matches the reported tactics of the Massilian party too closely for it to be possible to regard him simply as a bystander to the debate. Not without reason was Prosper mistrustful of the "conference" as a mode of theological discourse, at least as practiced in his own milieu. Faithfully as he might transcribe and adapt Augustine's writings, he was at a disadvantage when competing with the vivid presences conjured by the man he called the *Collator*.

In the simulated desert dialogue of his thirteenth *Conference*, composed ca. 426, Cassian made it appear that ideas about divine aid and human effort were best transmitted in the practical, oral instruction of a monastic disciple by his master; a person's assurance of holding the catholic faith lay in the existential continuity of ancient and widely attested habits of life, not in the empty words of theological controversy.[61] A similar emphasis

---

[58] Prosper, *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum* cap. 3 (PL 51,179C).

[59] *Pace* William O'Connor, "St. Vincent of Lerins and St. Augustine," *Doctor Communis* 16 (1963) 123-157, who disputes the identification made by Hugo Koch, "Vincenz von Lerin und Gennadius," in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 31.2 (Leipzig 1907) 43-47. The Augustinian *Excerpta* were first edited by José Madoz in 1940. Vincent's texts are cited here in the edition of R. Demeulenaere (CCSL 64).

[60] Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee* (above, n. 20) 149-170 ("Der Konzilsbegriff des Vinzenz von Lerin"), esp. 164 ff.; Agostino Pastorino, "Il concetto di 'tradizione' in Giovanni Cassiano e in Vincenzo di Lerino," *Sileno* 1 (1975) 37-46. The authors independently conclude that Vincent's concepts of tradition and unity in doctrine are analogous to those expounded by Cassian in his monastic treatises and the *Contra Nestorium*. See further Vessey, "Ideas of Christian Writing" (above, n. 26) 223-237.

[61] Cassian, *Conlationes* 13,18 (CSEL 57,467): "Per quod evidenti ratione colligitur ab his qui non loquacibus verbis, sed experientia duce vel magnitudinem gratiae vel modulum humani metiuntur arbitrii. . . . Et idcirco hoc AB OMNIBUS CATHOLICIS PATRIBUS definitur, qui perfectionem cordis non inani disputatione verborum, sed re atque opere didicerunt. . . . Si quid sane versutius humana argumentatione ac ratione collectum huic

on personal discipleship, oral transmission, and sanctity of life marks the construction of orthodoxy in his polemical treatise *Against Nestorius* (430), a work whose genre nevertheless allowed the citation of written *testimonia*, including two in this case from the writings of Augustine, "bishop of Hippo Regius."[62] Oral conference and textual collation were thus assimilated, but in such a way that special value still attached to the living word of a teacher.[63] As we have seen, Augustine was a past master of the conference, especially the kind involving collation of texts. Now a community of readers in Gaul was inserting his texts into a collective doctrinal oeuvre or universal Text (capital "T") that was at once residually oral and as firmly shaped by writing as his own published *opus*. After Cassian, Vincent is that community's most able spokesman.

According to Prosper, those who drew up lists of objectionable "Augustinian" positions on grace and predestination did so in order to distract their readers from proper scrutiny of the *libri Augustini*.[64] Less pejoratively, we may say that the Massilians' purpose was to circumscribe the part of this author's literary output that would henceforth be considered doctrinally normative. The tergiversations of modern scholarship notwithstanding, Vincent's stake in that enterprise is beyond reasonable doubt.[65] By setting the problem of the reception of Augustine's oeuvre in the context of a larger theory of the *writerly* elaboration of Christian dogma, he carried his Gallic and other readers decisively into the post-Augustinian era.

---

sensui videtur obsistere, vitandum magis est quam ad destructionem fidei provocandum." These two conferences belong to a set dedicated to the abbot of Lérins and a monk associated with that community. See also Conrad Leyser, "'Lectio Divina, Oratio Pura': Rhetoric and the Techniques of Asceticism in the *Conferences* of John Cassian," in *Modelli di santità, modelli di comportamento*, eds. G. Barone *et al.* (Rome 1994) 79-105.

[62] Cassian, *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium* 7,24-31 at 27. Marie-Anne Vannier "Jean Cassien a-t-il fait oeuvre de théologien dans le *De incarnatione Domini*?," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 66 (1992) 119-132 observes the congruence with Vincent's methods in the *Commonitorium*.

[63] Note the terms of the final appeal to the authority of John Chrysostom, "qui communis mihi ac vobis [sc. Nestorio] magister fuit, cuius discipuli atque institutio sumus" (CSEL 17,390). In the next sentence Nestorius is referred to John's writings.

[64] Prosper, *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium* praef. (PL 51,156A).

[65] Although now in need of modification in places, José Madoz, *El concepto de la tradición en san Vicente de Lerins: Estudio historico-critico del Conmonitorio*, Analecta Gregoriana 5 (Rome 1933) and *Excerpta Vincentii Lirinensis*, Estudios Onienses 1.1 (Madrid 1940) are still the best guides.

Despite the initial affectation of an orality reminiscent of Cassian's *Conferences*, the *Commonitorium* is a studiously chirographic work.[66] Combining recent data from the acts of the anti-Nestorian Council of Ephesus with documentation on the theological controversies of the previous two centuries, the author constructs a narrative of the progressive *textual* formulation of Catholic dogmas in which special importance is attributed, first, to conciliar creeds and, secondly, to statements derived from comparison of the written opinions of reputable Christian teachers. Of the three criteria posited for the determination of orthodoxy (ubiquity, antiquity, unanimity), only the first appears even potentially applicable without recourse to documents.[67] In practice, the search for true doctrine turns out to be a search for textual harmony, whether ready-made in a formula like the Nicene Creed or newly brought to light by the Catholic excerptor-compiler.[68] To illustrate the process of patristic collation,[69] Vincent refers to a dossier of texts presented at the Council of Ephesus.[70] (We have seen, however, that Massilian readers did not wait for Cyril of Alexandria to give them lessons in this new art.) Turning from events at Ephesus to take a general view of the issue of heretical innovation, he then quotes a document whose specific reference, though omitted, would have been fresh in the minds of his first readers. By an ingenious soliciting of Pope Celestine's letter of ca. 431, he encourages the suspicion that it was Augustine's Gallic supporters, not his critics, who preached a novel doctrine of predestination.[71]

---

[66] Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee* 155: "Die Eigenart der Anwendung [of the principle of referring to 'tradition' as a guarantee of orthodoxy] besteht, kurz gesagt, darin, daß Vinzenz eine *schriftliche* Quelle neben, um nicht zu sagen, über der Schrift postuliert." Cf. Vessey, "Peregrinus against the Heretics: Classicism, Provinciality and the Place of the Alien Writer in Late Roman Gaul," in *Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum"* 46 (Rome 1994) 530-565, esp. 553-5. Note the citation of Deut. 32:7 ("Interroga patres tuos . . .") at *Commonitorium* 1,1, quickly assimilated to a literate context. For an earlier application of the same verse, see n. 21 above.

[67] Yet in order to invoke the faith of the church as a whole ("quod ubique creditum est"), Catholic opponents of the Donatists referred to written texts: *Commonitorium* 6,3-10.

[68] On the paradigmatic importance of the Nicene Creed for Vincent, see Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee* 157 f. This text is central to his discussion of the criterion of antiquity.

[69] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 3,4 (CCSL 64,150): "operam dabit, ut conlatas inter se maiorum consulat interrogetque sententias."

[70] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 29-30, citing a set of patristic *testimonia* read out by Cyril during the first session. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee* 159, notes that Vincent gives this document a prominence it did not have at the council, at the expense of the Nicene Creed. See also n. 76 below.

[71] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 32,4-7 (CCSL 64:193), concluding: "Ergo haec fuit beati

Given what is known about the Gallic habit of reading Augustine's later anti-Pelagian works *against* the concerted testimony of earlier Catholic authors, it is notable that Vincent's one other extant production (apart from the anti-Augustinian *Objections* quoted by Prosper) consists of a set of excerpts from the African's writings on the Trinity and Incarnation, offered as an authoritative statement of Catholic doctrine, and including passages from the (two-book) *De praedestinatione*! As an ensemble—more exactly, as a concise instantiation of the imagined universal Text of Christian orthodoxy—these excerps are said to represent the sense of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the ancients; in collecting them into a book, Vincent spoke as if for all the holy fathers, albeit in the words of one man.[72] What is striking about this contention is that it flatly contradicts a principle enunciated in the *Commonitorium*, namely that proof of consensus (outside the decrees of church councils) required the production of multiple witnesses.[73] How is the inconsistency to be explained? Vincent himself implies that since Augustine had consulted many previous writers, his own works might be regarded—on certain topics—as models of doctrinal *collatio*.[74] Although not explicitly envisaged in the *Commonitorium*, this possibility would have been attractive to a dogmatist who, like others of his and the next generation, seems to have yearned for a trinitarian-christological formula that would take account of doctrinal developments that had supervened since the (late fourth-century) consecration of the Creed of Nicaea.[75] The Council

---

Caelestini beata sententia, ut non vetustas cessaret obruere novitatem, sed potius novitas desineret incessere vetustatem"; Madoz, *El concepto* 79-83. Madoz goes too far, however, in reducing the *Commonitorium* as a whole to "un panfleto contra San Agustín" (89). The opposite error—that is, to deny that the work is marked *in any way* by opposition to Augustine's teaching on predestination—is represented by O'Connor (above, n. 59) 194 ff. and Elie Griffe, "Pro Vincentio Lerinensi," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 62 (1961) 26-32.

[72] Vincent, *Excerpta* 1 (CCSL 64,202): "ipsum beatae memoriae sanctum Augustinum, immo per eum Christi potius et ecclesiae antiquam et universalem fidem audiamus loquentem"; 10 (231): "licet unius sacerdotis verbis omnium sanctorum patrum sensu locuti esse videamur."

[73] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 3,4 (CCSL 64,150): "non unus aut duo tantum"; 27,4 (186): "multorum . . . magistrorum"; 28,7 (187): "velut quodam . . . magistrorum concilio."

[74] Vincent, *Excerpta* 1 (CCSL 64,202): "Ait namque: Omnes quos legere potui qui ante me scripserunt de Trinitate quae Deus est, divinorum librorum . . . catholici tractatores hoc intenderunt secundum scripturas docere . . . [= *De Trinitate* 1.4.7]."

[75] For an instance of post-Nicene credal drafting from Vincent's own milieu, known to both Augustine and Cassian, see the *Libellus emendationis* of Leporius (CCSL 64,111-23). Credal summaries are particularly favoured by Gennadius of Marseille in his *De viris illustribus*.

of Ephesus had produced no such text.[76] The *Commonitorium* gestures towards it in language that consistently evokes the progressive consolidation, unfolding, and artistic enhancement of dogma.[77] By stringing together the "jewels" of Augustine's teaching as a charm against the errors of Arius, Photinus, Apollinarius and Nestorius,[78] Vincent may have hoped to advance a collective work of literary-dogmatic art, the end of which would be an expression of the essence of the Catholic faith attributable to no one individual, except by accidental association, because truly universal—an abridgement *in modum symboli* of the orthodox Text.[79]

Evidence that Vincent, like the emperor Theodosius II, called on Augustine posthumously to contribute to the work of the Council of Ephesus does nothing to weaken the inference that the *Commonitorium* was in some sense a product of Massilian efforts to limit the receivable part of his oeuvre. On the contrary, representing Augustine's works (down to the last) as a rich hoard of trinitarian and christological *sententiae* was a shrewd way of excluding

---

[76] Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1: *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, trans. John Bowden, 2nd edn. (London 1975) 486: "for the Fathers of 431 Nicaea provided the really authoritative christological formula, the simple wording of which was once again no more than a re-presentation of the apostolic faith and the tradition of the primitive church." Cf. Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee* 244. In fact, the council explicitly forbade the drafting of new credal formulae.

[77] After explaining the errors of Nestorius, Photinus and Apollinaris, Vincent embarks at *Commonitorium* 13,5 on an essay in trinitarian-christological definition: "Sed operae pretium est, ut id ipsum [i.e., the orthodox dogma] etiam atque etiam distinctius et expressius enucleemus" (CCSL 64,164). Note also *Commonitorium* 23,1-13, where the development (*profectus*) of religious doctrine is successively compared to the growth of a living body, the fruition of plants, and the finishing of a work of art. It is the last analogy ("ut prisca illa . . . dogmata processu temporis excurentur, limentur, poliantur" [CCSL 64,179]) that most clearly implies a role for human *tractatores* and *collatores* working in a literary medium; cf Madoz, *El concepto* 129-130; Marc Lods, "Le progrès dans le temps de l'Eglise selon Vincent de Lérins," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 55 (1975) 384-385. The miniaturism of Vincent's verbal aesthetic accords with his insistence on concise forms of dogmatic expression, e.g., at *Commonitorium* 23,19 (CCSL 64,180): "magnam rerum summam paucis litteris comprehendendo."

[78] Vincent, *Excerpta* 10 (CCSL 64,231): "Haec sunt quae de libris sancti Augustini in unum velut opusculum sparsim collecta digessimus. Quas ego non tam capitula quam gemmas potius et margaritas quasdam appellaverim." Cf. *Commonitorium* 22,6 (CCSL 64,177): "pretiosas divini dogmatis gemmas exsculpe, fideliter coapta, adorna sapienter, adice splendorem gratiam venustatem."

[79] For discussion of his role in the preparation of the so-called Athanasian Creed, see Madoz, *Excerpta* 65-90; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Athanasian Creed* (London 1964) 116-119. "The conclusion is inescapable," writes Kelly, "that Lérins was the cradle of the creed" (119).

their other contents from consideration.[80] For all their interest in concise forms of dogmatic expression, Gallic authors of this period show little inclination to expand the credal format to accommodate doctrines of grace and free will. Like Pelagius, Caelestius, and other creative theologians of the Theodosian Age, they preferred to leave such matters outside the orbit of the faith required in a profession of orthodoxy.[81] Augustine took the opposite view. Summarizing Catholic dogma and his own teachings in the *Enchiridion* (ca. 422), he combined orthodox doctrine of the nature of God with an exposition of the regime of divine grace, in a manner unknown to the prior tradition of creed-making.[82] The author of the *Commonitorium* interprets the "rule of faith" in a more restricted sense, implicitly ruling out the disputed articles on grace and predestination.[83] As honorary draftsman to the Council of Ephesus in the *Excerpta*, Vincent's Augustine forfeits his claim to the precarious textual consensus constructed in the *Contra Iulianum*.

It is possible to discern in the *Commonitorium* the shadow of an even more radically reductive approach to Augustine's work as a publishing theologian. Like Tertullian, Vincent interprets Galatians 1:8 as a ban on every kind of doctrinal innovation. "Why then," he has an imaginary interlocutor ask, "does God so often allow outstanding churchmen to preach novelties?" The perils of allegiance to a trusted master who succumbs to error are developed at length, in a passage for which Tertullian offers no hint.[84] Nestorius, Photinus, Apollinarius, Origen, and Tertullian himself are cited[85] as instances of teachers who for a time flourished conspicuously in the faith but fell "at the end" into heresy.[86] Vincent's handling of the cases of Origen and Tertullian reflects the controversy thirty years earlier between Jerome and Rufinus over the alleged heretical interpolation of Origen's writings. Now as then the issue was one of textual credibility.[87] Rufinus' attempt to

---

[80] Gennadius of Marseilles, writing under Vincent's influence thirty years later, lists only three works in his notice on Augustine (*De viris illustribus* 39); one of them is the *De Trinitate*, another a *De incarnatione Domini* (a florilegium?). See also n. 92 below.

[81] Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* 137-141.

[82] Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. from the 3rd German edn. by J. Millar (London 1898) 5.222-240.

[83] Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius" (above, n. 25) 220. *Commonitorium* 28,16 (CCSL 64,189): the purpose of the Council of Ephesus was "to fix the rule of faith," supposedly by recourse to patristic texts. Cf. *ibid.* 29,9-10; 30,6.

[84] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 10; cf. Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 4.

[85] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 11; 17-19.

[86] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 17,1 (CCSL 64,170): "ad extremum."

[87] Vessey, "The Forging of Orthodoxy" (above, n. 23).

save the texts of Origen had ended ingloriously. Tertullian's final error "detracted from the authority of his otherwise trustworthy writings."[88] If there was a practical lesson to be drawn from these precedents, Vincent refrains from stating it. A train of thought that would leave Augustine's works subject to the kind of censure already placed on Origen's was too disturbing to be followed to its logical conclusion, even by so rigorous a critic as the Lerinian *commonitor*.[89]

It has been well said that "[b]y the preparation of the *Retractations* and by Possidius' authorship of the *Life of Augustine* and his compilation of the little pamphlet we call his *indiculum* of Augustine's writings, Augustine left this world with a more secure claim on future readers' attention than any other writer of his age."[90] With that posthumous authorial claim went a twofold challenge, spelled out in the *Retractations* and, as we have seen, implicit elsewhere. First, there was the invitation to readerly comprehensiveness and imitation. Students of Augustine were to treat the ensemble of his writings as an emergent, contextually determined whole, each part of which, duly considered, marked a passage in the author's personal quest for divine understanding. To read Augustine attentively was to mime and recapitulate his own prayerfully laborious "progress" towards God.[91] That was a stiff task, as early readers were quick to point out.[92] But it was less than the sum of what was asked of them. For they were also incited to readerly openness and collaboration, as (most plainly) at the close of his last finished work.[93] Nobody should mistake the "Complete Works" for the

---

[88] Vincent, *Commonitorium* 18,5 (CCSL 64,173), quoting Hilary of Poitiers.

[89] A contemporary reader, the Spaniard Consentius, was less cautious. See his letter of ca. 419 to Augustine (= Augustine), *Ep.* 12*,11-12 (ed. Divjak), with Norbert Brox, "Consentius über Origenes," *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982) 141-144 and Carol Quillen, "Consentius as a Reader of Augustine's *Confessions*," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 37 (1991) 100-101.

[90] James J. O'Donnell, "The Authority of Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 22 (1991) 7-35 at 16, a lecture to which this article owes more than can be conveyed by citation.

[91] From a different perspective, Stock, *Augustine the Reader* (above, n. 13) offers a masterly account of this process.

[92] On the difficulty, if not impossibility, of reading all that Augustine had written, see already Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 18,19; Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* 39; Eugippius, *Ep. ad Probam* 2,19; Isidore of Seville (PL 83,1109). The thought perhaps owes something to Jerome, *Ep.* 33.5 (on Origen), echoed by Vincent, *Commonitorium* 17,7.

[93] Augustine, *De dono perseverantiae* 24,68 (PL 45,1034): "Qui legunt haec, si intelligunt, agant Deo gratias: qui autem non intelligunt, orent ut eorum ille sit doctor interior, a

whole truth. To read Augustine attentively was to be alert to the inner promptings of the true Teacher and thus in a position to correct both him and his writings in the light of a hypothetical higher Text.

Measured against so elevated an ideal of collective or communal textuality, the shifts of readers like Florus, Prosper, Vincent and other Massilian critics of the late 420s and early 430s are bound to seem a little less than inspiring. Yet many of their concerns and strategies, as traced in these pages, were similar to those of Augustine himself, if not visibly derived from his work. In their zeal for the collation and reproduction of potentially normative texts, as in their attachment to a real or fictionalized oral pedagogy, these readers—as Christian writers, if not always as theologians—were natural heirs to the *Confessions* and *Retractations*. If there is a single major difference to be observed between their manner of proceeding and Augustine's as his own literary executor, it is, as we might expect, a circumstantial one. Free of the burdens of high pastoral office, international reputation, and the necessity of answering a Julian of Eclanum, monastic and lay writers of the next generation could afford to economize where the bishop of Hippo had latterly been most prolific. No heroes, they were content to make a world—and work—for themselves within the expanding textual universe of Latin Christianity. They did so, in the first place, by assigning limits to the *opus Augustinianum*.[94]

The University of British Columbia
Dept. of English
#397-1873 East Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z1

---

cuius facie est scientia et intellectus. Qui vero errare me existimant, etiam atque etiam diligenter quae sunt dicta considerent, ne fortassis ipsi errent. Ego autem, cum per eos qui meos labores legunt non solum doctior verum etiam emendatior fio, propitium mihi Deum agnosco; et hoc per ecclesiae doctores maxime exspecto, si et in ipsorum manus venit, dignanturque nosse quod scribo." Vincent, *Commonitorium* 1,7 is careful not to be taken for one of the *doctores ecclesiae* of whom Augustine expected most.

[94] This paper has benefitted from the comments of members of Professor Peter Brown's Late Antique Seminar at Princeton University, where I had the opportunity to read a draft of it in February 1997.

A REMINISCENCE OF THE *CHALDEAN ORACLES* AT GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *OR.* 29,2:
ΟΙΟΝ ΚΡΑΤΗΡ ΤΙΣ ΥΠΕΡΕΡΡΥΗ

BY

RUTH MAJERCIK

The complete text is as follows (*Or.* 29,2; 180, 18-22 Gallay *SC* 250): Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὑπέρχυσιν ἀγαθότητος εἰπεῖν θαρρήσομεν, ὃ τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι φιλοσοφησάντων εἰπεῖν τις ἐτόλμησεν, οἷον κρατήρ τις ὑπερερρύη,* σαφῶς οὑτωσὶ λέγων, ἐν οἷς περὶ πρώτου αἰτίου καὶ δευτέρου φιλοσοφεῖ.

*ὑπερερρύη (WVSD): ὑπερρύη (-ρύει A) Gallay

> For, indeed, we dare not speak of a "superabundance of goodness" like one of the Greek philosophers boldly declared, "as though a mixing bowl has overflowed," and he says this explicitly in the treatise where he deals with the first cause and second cause.

The various scholarly attempts to identify the source of the phrases ὑπέρχυσιν ἀγαθότητος and οἷον κρατήρ τις ὑπερερρύη are now nicely summed up by Frederick Norris in his recent commentary on Gregory's *Theological Orations.*[1] The general consensus is that these phrases are dependent in some fashion on Plotinus, *Enn.* V.2.1.7-9 H-S (with reference to the "overflowing of the One"): ὃν γὰρ τέλειον τῷ μηδὲν ζητεῖν μηδὲ ἔχειν μηδὲ δεῖσθαι *οἷον ὑπερερρύη καὶ τὸ ὑπερπλῆρες* αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν ἄλλο. That Gregory was not directly dependent on Plotinus is indicated by his use of the two quotes in question, which are not Plotinian, but the precise source in which he found this material is problematic. On this last point, what is at issue is how to interpret Gregory's words ἐν οἷς περὶ πρώτου αἰτίου καὶ δευτέρου φιλοσοφεῖ. Is this phrase meant as an allusion to the general subject matter of *Enn.* V.2.1 (Whittaker),[2] to that of another treatise (Gallay suggests V.1.6),[3] or

[1] *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen* (Leiden 1991) 134-135.

[2] See J. Whittaker, "Proclus, Procopius, Psellus and the Scholia on Gregory Nazianzen,"

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

is it an actual title: "On the First Cause and the Second"? This last is the opinion of Rist,[4] who points out that this is not the title assigned to V.2 by Porphyry: "On the Origin and Order of Beings After the First." He notes that Gregory's title is actually closer to that found in the Arabic *Theology of Aristotle* X: "The First Cause and the Things that Originate from It." This connection is of some interest. The *Theology of Aristotle* is, of course, a misnomer; this Arabic translation of an original Greek work is, in fact, a commentary on the *Enneads*. The author of the original Greek text is now generally thought to be Porphyry,[5] although Zimmerman has recently argued that the *Theology* is the work of an Arab redactor of the *Enneads* influenced by Proclus.[6] In either case, the *caveat* is that the two phrases cited by Gregory are missing from this text.[7] So this source, at least in the form we now have it, is problematic. This is also true of Gallay's suggestion, who notes a dependence on *Enn.* V.1.6. In this instance, although the general subject matter and terminology recalls Gregory's phrasing (a consideration of how the One produces Intellect as a "second"), the imagery used is that of "radiation" (περίλαμψις; i.e., Intellect proceeds from the One like the "radiation" of light from the sun, heat from fire, cold from snow etc.) not "overflowing."[8] In addition, if Gregory has a specific title in mind,

---

VigChr 2 (1975) 309; cf. J. Barbel, *Gregor von Nazianz: Die Fünf Theologischen Reden* (Düsseldorf 1963) 130 n. 10.

[3] Gallay, *SC* 250, 181 nn. 4 and 5.

[4] J.M. Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism'" in idem, *Platonism and its Christian Heritage* (London 1985) XII, 215-216.

[5] See R. Walzer, "Porphyry and the Arabic Tradition" in *Porphyre*, Entretiens Hardt XII (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1966) 275-297; P. Thillet, "Indices Porphyriens dans la Théologie D'Aristote" in *Le Néoplatonisme* (Paris 1971) 293-302; S. Pinès, "Les Textes Arabes dits Plotiniens et le courant 'Porphyrien' dans le Néoplatonisme Grec" in *ibid.*, 303-313.

[6] F.W. Zimmerman, "The Origins of the So-Called *Theology of Aristotle*" in *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages: The Theology and Other Texts* (London 1986) 110-240; see, in response, P. Thillet, "Note sur la *Théologie d'Aristote*" in *La Vie de Plotin* II, eds. Luc Brisson *et al.* (Paris 1992) 625-637; cf. M.-O. Goulet-Gazé, "L'École de Plotin" in *LVP* I (Paris 1982) 305-325.

[7] See the English translation of G. Lewis in Henry and Schwyzer's *editio maior, Plotini Opera* II (Paris/Brussels 1959) 291.

[8] It should be noted that Plotinus does mention the image of "flowing" at V.1.6.7 ("a great multiplicity flowed from (ἐξερρύη)" the One), but this image is subsequently abandoned for that of "radiation" when he specifically speaks of the procession of Intellect from the One (6.28 ff.).

the title of V.1 ("On the Three Primary Hypostases") is not reflected in his wording. In sum, none of these solutions is entirely satisfactory.

On the first point, it can be noted that the term ὑπέρχυσις is rare. It is not otherwise found in Plotinus nor, to my knowledge, in any other Neoplatonic work. On the other hand, the term ὑπερπλήρης is common in later Neoplatonism and Proclus, in at least one instance, combines it with ἀγαθότης: *Pl. th.*, II 8; 57,3 Saffrey-Westerink: ὑπερπλήρους ἀγαθότητος (as descriptive of the first principle).[9] A similar expression, ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀγαθότητα (with reference to the gods in general), is found in Porphyry's *Letter to Anebo* (= Iamblichus, *DM* III 17 (139,15) des Places).[10] These parallels, then, conform to Gregory's usage, and thus confirm the Neoplatonic origin of the phrase. As for the expression κρατήρ τις ὑπερερρύη, the verb ὑπερρές is a Plotinian *hapax* (*LSJ* cites no other occurrence of the word; Lampe has no entry at all). *Krater* is found elsewhere in Plotinus with reference to Plato, *Timaeus* 41 D,[11] but the specific expression κρατήρ τις ὑπερερρύη is not Plotinian. That the author of the phrase is dependent on Plotinus is indicated by his use of the *hapax*, but κρατήρ τις needs another explanation.

One possibility, suggested by Whittaker, is that the term is Christian—a reference to "the chalice as the cup of life"—and, thus, has been added by Gregory.[12] Others have suggested an allusion to the *krater* of Plato (*Tim.* 41 D)[13] although the analogy is inexact: Plato speaks of the blending and mixing of Soul within the *krater* whereas Gregory talks of a *krater* "overflowing." I think both these suggestions are incorrect and that a better explanation

---

[9] *Pl. th.*, II 8; 57, 1-3: . . . τοῦ ἔρωτος, ὃν ἔχει τὰ πάντα κατὰ φύσιν, τῆς ἀγνώστου καὶ ἀρρήτου καὶ ἀμεθέκτου καὶ ὑπερπλήρους ἀγαθότητος (". . . of the love, which all things naturally possess, for the unknowable, ineffable, unparticipated and superabundant Goodness"); cf. *ET* 119: Πᾶς θεὸς κατὰ τὴν ὑπερούσιον ἀγαθότητα ὑφέστηκε ("Every god subsists in terms of its superessential goodness").

[10] *DM* III 17 (139,13-17): Τὸ δὲ οὐ καλῶς ὑπολαμβάνεις, "τὴν περιουσίαν τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν θεῶν καὶ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀγαθότητα καὶ τὴν πάντα περιέχουσαν αἰτίαν κηδεμονίαν τε ἡμῶν καὶ προστασίαν ὑπηρεσίαν" ἐπονομάζων. ("But you do not correctly understand it when you call 'service the surpassing power of the gods, their superabundant goodness, the cause which encompasses all, and their care and protection of us.'") This quotation is not cited as part of Porphyry's text by Sodano, *Porfirio, Lettera ad Anebo* (Naples 1958), but is so indicated by des Places.

[11] *Enn.* IV 3.7.10; 8.4.36; V 1.8.6.

[12] Whittaker, *op. cit.*, 310.

[13] See B. Wyss, "Gregor II (Gregor von Nazianz)" in *RAC* XII, 833; cf. Barbel, *op. cit.*, 130 n. 9.

can be found in the context of Neoplatonic exegesis of the *Chaldean Oracles*.[14] *Krater* is a term of the *Oracles*—πηγαίους κρατῆρας (fr. 42)[15]—an expression which is utilized by the Neoplatonists in connection with the role of the Chaldean Hecate as "source of souls" (πηγὴ ψυχῶν) or "soul source" (πηγαία ψυχή; πηγαία Ἑκάτη).[16] This language, in turn, draws on fr. 51, where the "primal Soul"—in a "great stream" (πολλὴ λιβάς)—is said to "gush forth" (βλύζει) from the "hollow" of Hecate's "right flank"[17] and fr. 52, where the "source of virtue" (ἀρετῆς πηγή) is said to exist "in the left flank of Hecate";[18] in fr. 32, Hecate is described as the "life-giving womb" (ζῳογόνον κόλπον).[19]

---

[14] Whittaker, *op. cit.*, 312-313, notes references to the *Oracles* in the scholia on Gregory, but does not then connect the *Oracles* to the passage in question.

[15] Fr. 42 = Proclus, *In Parm.* 769, 11-13:
δεσμῷ ἔρωτος ἀγητοῦ, ὃς ἐκ νόου ἔκθορε πρῶτος,
ἐσσάμενος πυρὶ πῦρ συνδέσμιον, ὄφρα κεράσσῃ
πηγαίους κρατῆρας ἑοῦ πυρὸς ἄνθος ἐπισχών.
By the bond of wondrous Love, which first leapt forth from Intellect, clothing his binding fire with fire in order to mingle the *source craters* while offering the flower of his own fire.

References to the *Oracles* in this paper are from my edition, *The Chaldean Oracles* (Leiden 1989); the numbering of the fragments in my edition follows that of É. des Places, *Oracles Chaldaïques* (Paris 1971).

[16] πηγαία ψυχή: Proclus, *In Tim.*, I 318, 12; II 117, 29; 275, 2 = Theodore of Asine, Test. 6; 32, 19 Deuse; πηγαία Ἑκάτη: Damascius, *In Parm.* § 182; II 59, 21 Ruelle.

[17] Fr. 51 = Proclus, *In rem p.* II 201, 14-16:
δεξιτερῆς μὲν γὰρ λαγόνος περὶ χήραμα χόνδρων
πολλὴ ἄδην βλύζει ψυχῆς λιβὰς ἀρχιγενέθλου
ἄρδην ἐμψυχοῦσα φάος πῦρ αἰθέρα κόσμους.
Around the hollow of her right flank a great stream of the primal Soul gushes forth in abundance, totally ensouling light, fire, ether, worlds.

[18] Fr. 52 = Psellus, *PG* 122, 1136 a 11-12:
λαιῇς ἐν λαγόσιν Ἑκάτης ἀρετῆς πέλε πηγή,
ἔνδον ὅλη μίμνουσα τὸ παρθένον οὐ προϊεῖσα.
In the left flank of Hecate exists the source of virtue, which remains entirely within and does not give up its virginity.

[19] Fr. 32 = Proclus, *In Tim.*, I 420, 13-16:

ἐργάτις, ἐκδότις ἐστὶ πυρὸς ζωηφόρου ⟨αὕτη⟩,
καὶ τὸν ζῳογόνον πληροῦσ' Ἑκάτης ⏑⏑ υ κόλπον
. . . . . ἐπιρρεῖ τοῖς συνοχεῦσιν
ἀλκὴν ζειδώροιο πυρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο.
Worker, dispenser of life-bearing fire is <that one>, and filling up the life-giving womb of Hecate . . . it causes to flow upon the connectors a force of fruitful and very powerful fire.

Thus Hecate, in Neoplatonic exegesis, becomes the "life-giving" or *zoogonic* "source," "soul source," "womb" or *krater* in which all things are contained and go forth. This imagery is also linked in Neoplatonic exegesis with the *krater* of the *Timaeus* and that of the *Orphica*. A few examples from Proclus' writings will illustrate these various associations:

> And the Barbarians (sc. the Chaldeans) call this *zoogonic* cause "soul source" (πηγαίαν ψυχήν), which has appeared along with "the virtue source" (τῆς πηγαίας ἀρετῆς) from the "flanks" of the universal, life-giving divinity, in whom are contained the sources of all life—divine, angelic, daimonic, psychic, physical. (*In Tim.*, III 249, 12-16)

> And the term "he poured" (κατεχεῖτο, *Tim.* 41 D) designates the procession downward and the unbounded flowing (τῆς ἀορίστου χύσεως). And if you understand pouring (τὴν κατάχυσιν) in the way that it is used with respect to liquids, then, perhaps, you will understand that this same expression is also appropriate with respect to the Soul; for liquid is a symbol of life. This is why Plato and before him, the gods, call the Soul both "stream" (λιβάδα) of the entire *zoogonic* nature and a certain "source" (πηγήν). (*In Tim.*, III 256, 30-257, 5)

> Certain others frequently mention "source *kraters*" (πηγαίους κρατῆρας), and Timaeus calls a *krater* the cause in which the kinds of being are mixed. (*In Parm.*, 777, 9-12)

> And the "life-giving *krater*" (κρατῆρα τὸν ζῳογόνον) is analogous to Night, who, along with Phanes, brings forth all life from the invisible; likewise, the *krater* bears every soul for those in the world. (*In Tim.*, III 170, 4-6; cf. *Orph. Fr.* 104 Kern)

> For the Barbarians have also called the particular sources, "source *kraters*" (πηγαίους κρατῆρας). This *krater*, then, is also a "source *krater*" (πηγαῖος κρατήρ), for it is the cause of souls . . . Moreover, we call the very first soul, "source" (πηγαίαν), and the "*krater*, source" (κρατῆρα πηγαῖον) by itself . . . (*In Tim.*, III 250, 8-16)

> And the *krater* itself is a "source" (πηγαῖος); at any rate, the gods also have called the primordial causes of particular beings "source *kraters*" (πηγαίους κρατῆρας). (*Pl. th.*, V 32; 120, 22-25 Saffrey-Westerink)

> Therefore, the *krater* is the "source" (πηγή) of souls. (*Pl. th.*, V 31; 115, 10 S-W)

This imagery, common in Proclus, can be traced back to Porphyry, the first commentator on the *Oracles*. In particular, the expression "soul source" (L. *anima fons*) is found in a number of Latin writers dependent on Porphyry, e.g., Marius Victorinus, *Adv. Ar.*, IV 5, 10-11: *animae . . . universalis atque fontanae; Adv. Ar.*, IV 11, 13: *animam fontemque animae*; Favonius Eulogius, *in Somn. Scip.*, XXII 37, 3-5 van Weddingen: *fontanae animae . . .* hinc dicitur

πηγαία; Martianus Capella, *De Nupt.*, II 205: *fontanam virginem.*[20] But it is Arnobius of Sicca, *Adversus Nationes*, II 25; 95, 10-14 Marchesi², also drawing on Porphyry,[21] who provides us with the closest parallel to Gregory's language:

> haecine est anima docta illa quam dicitis, immortalis perfecta divina, post deum principem rerum et post mentes geminas locum optinens quartum et *afluens ex crateribus vivis*?
>
> Is this that learned soul you speak of, immortal, perfect, divine, holding fourth place after God, the principle of the universe, and after the two intellects, and *flowing forth from living mixing bowls*?

This passage reflects the Chaldean order of first principles: Father, First or Paternal Intellect, Second or Demiurgic Intellect, Soul.[22] In this instance, the "living mixing bowls" are said to be the source of the Universal Soul rather than particular souls, but as with Gregory's phrase, these *crateres* are specifically linked with the image of "flowing" (*afluens* = ἀπορρέουσα? cf. *defluunt* below). Elsewhere, Arnobius connects images of "source," "flowing" and "Life" with the origin of the individual soul: II 15; 83, 11-12 Marchesi²: *et quia uno ex fonte omnium nostrum defluunt animae*; II 22; 91, 23-92, 2 Marchesi²: *et si verum est illum (sc. hominem) principalis esse substantiae portionem, iam laeta ex fontibus vitae derivatum hic agere.* Collectively, these passages from Arnobius recall the πηγαίους κρατῆρας of fr. 42 and of later Neoplatonic exegesis and the *zoogonic* imagery associated with Hecate as "soul source." The image

---

[20] Cf. τὸ παρθένον and πηγή, fr. 52 (above, n. 18). On these sources, see P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus* I (Paris 1968) 395-396 and n. 2.

[21] See, P. Courcelle, "Les Sages de Porphyre et les 'viri novi' d'Arnobe," *REL* 31 (1953) 257-271. Paolo Mastrandea has now argued that this Porphyrian material in Arnobius and other Latin sources is not directly dependent on Porphyry but has been mediated through Cornelius Labeo. Mastrandea considers Labeo a student of Porphyry at Rome. See P. Mastrandea, *Un Neoplatonico Latino: Cornelio Labeo* (Leiden 1979) esp. 127-134; 193-198; A. Smith, "Porphyrian Studies Since 1913" in *ANRW* II.36.2 (Berlin/New York 1987) 766-768. Cf. A.-J. Festugière, "La Doctrine des 'viri novi' sur l'Origine et le Sort des Ames" in *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris 1940) 13-132, who argues for a variety of sources, including Porphyry; M. Mazza, "Studia Arnobiana," *Helikon*, 3 (1963) 111-169, who makes a case for gnostic influence; A. le Bonniec, *Arnobe: Contre les Gentils* I (Paris 1982) 41-46, who reviews the various opinions, but prefers to leave "the debate open." Further volumes of this Budé edition have not yet appeared.

[22] See, e.g., Festugière, *La Révélation D'Hermès Trismégiste* III (Paris 1953) 50-59; H. Lewy, *Chaldean Oracles and Theurgy*, new ed. by Michel Tardieu (Paris 1978) 316-326; J. Dillon, "The Concept of Two Intellects: A Foonote to the History of Platonism," *Phronesis*, 18 (1973) 176-185; cf. *Chald. Or.* frr. 7 and 8 Majercik and notes *ad loc.*

of "flowing," however—as an emanative metaphor—is more reminiscent of Plotinus than the *Oracles*. In the *Oracles*, verbs such as βλύξω, ῥοιζέω and compounds of θρῴσκω (ἐκθρῴσκω, ἐνθρῴσκω, ἀποθρῴσκω) are regularly used to describe the production of lower entities from their superiors;[23] in Plotinus, in contrast, ῥέω and its compounds (ἀπορρέω, ἐκρέω, ὑπερρέω) are the norm.[24] Arnobius' statements, then, influenced by Porphyry, most likely reflect a combination of Chaldean and Plotinian terminology. If so, it is also likely that Porphyry linked the Chaldean *krater* with Plotinus' language in *Enn.* V.2.1, and thus was the source of Gregory's phrase, κρατήρ τις ὑπερερρύη. Porphyry, then, would also be the source of Gregory's other expression, ὑπέρχυσιν ἀγαθότητος (cf. ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀγαθότητα in his *Letter to Anebo*). That Gregory refers to the author of this material with a certain hostility ("like one of the Greek philosophers boldly declared") also suggests Porphyry—the great enemy of the Christians.[25] As for the specific source of the quotes, Porphyry's *Commentary on the Enneads* (or, perhaps, a brief "summary" circulated with *Enn.* V.2)[26] is a reasonable guess, but if so, not in the form now preserved in the Arabic *Theology of Aristotle.*

1089 Cambridge Drive, *Santa Barbara*, CA 93111-1000 USA

[23] βλύξω, frr. 37, 51; ῥοιζέω, fr. 37; ἐκθρῴσκω, frr. 35, 37, 42; ἐνθρῴσκω, frr. 34, 76, 87; ἀποθρῴσκω, fr. 34. ῥέω is attested once in fr. 31, ἐπιρρέω, once in fr. 32.

[24] See J.H. Sleeman and G. Pollet, *Lexicon Plotinianum* (Leiden 1980). The references to ῥέω and its compounds are too numerous to mention. In contrast, there are no references to βλύξω or ῥοιζέω and only a singular reference to ἐκθρῷσκω, *Enn.* VI.4.16.29.

[25] Cf. the polemical aside in *Or.* 5,41; 379, 1-2 Bernardi *SC* 309: . . . τῶν Πορφυρίου ψευσμάτων καὶ ληρημάτων. . . . According to Wyss, *op. cit.*, this is the only instance in which Gregory actually names a Neoplatonist.

[26] Cf. *VP* 26: . . . ὑπομνήματα . . . κεφάλαια . . . ἐπιχειρήματα. . . . On Porphyry's "summaries" of the *Enneads*, see M.-O. Goulet-Gazé, 'L'École de Plotin,' 315 ff.

MAINTAINING BOUNDARIES: THE STATUS OF ACTRESSES IN EARLY CHRISTIAN SOCIETY*

BY

DOROTHEA R. FRENCH

Recent studies on the Christianization of the Roman Empire have shed important light upon the conversion of such groups as the educated elite and women.[1] There has been, however, little scholarship devoted to the impact of Christianity upon the lower classes.[2] This study makes a contribution toward that broader field of scholarship by examining the social and legal status of actresses who were near the bottom of the social scale. Did the Christian concept of baptism as a ritual which completely washed away a person's past have a significant impact on improving the social and legal status of actresses in late antiquity? One of the most important signifyers of the measure of both classical and Christian attitudes toward actresses is the marriage codes because the law clearly draws the boundary

* I would like to thank Elizabeth Clark and Susan Ashbrook Harvey for reading an earlier draft of this article and offering valuable suggestions.

[1] See especially Peter Brown, *Power and persuasion in late antiquity: towards a Christian empire* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992) and M.K. Hopkins, "Elite Mobility in the Roman Empire," *Past and Present* 32 (1965), 12-26 on the educated elite. Among the numerous studies on women see: Antti Arjava, "Women in the Christian Empire: Ideological Change and Social Reality," *StPatr* 24 (1991), 6-9; Gillian Cloke, *This Female Man of God: Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, A.D. 350-450* (London: Routledge, 1995); Averil Cameron, "Early Christianity and the Discourse of Female Desire," in Léonie J. Archer, Susan Fischler, and Maria Wyke, eds., *Women in Ancient Societies: "An illusion of the night"* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994); Elizabeth A. Clark, "Sexual Politics in the Writings of John Chrysostom," *Anglican Theological Review* 49 (1977), 3-20; Judith Herrin, "Public and Private Forms of Religious Commitment among Byzantine Women," in *Women in Ancient Societies*, 181-196; and Frederick C. Klawiter, "The Role of Martyrdom and Persecution in Developing the Priestly Authority of Women in Early Christianity: A Case Study of Montanism," *CH* 49 (1980), 251-261.

[2] See the pioneering study of P.R.C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris: A social study of the emperor's freedmen and slaves* (Cambridge: University Press, 1972); and T.M. Finn, "Social Mobility, Imperial Civil Service and the Spread of Early Christianity," *StPatr* 17:1 (1982), 31-35.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

line between who is accepted and who is excluded in society. Beginning in the first century actresses were classed as infamous persons and thus prohibited from contracting a marriage with a freeborn person. Did the marriage of Theodora, a former actress, to Justinian in 524 C.E. offer women of the stage an unprecedented opportunity to improve their legal and social status in early Byzantine society as some scholars have assumed?[3] By examining a wide spectrum of sources, including marriage codes from the first through sixth centuries, the writings of the Church Fathers, and the Lives of actress/prostitutes this study concludes that the majority of actresses in early Byzantine society suffered the same negative social and legal prejudices they had since the time of Augustus.

Theatrical performances, *ludi scaenici*, were an integral part of the public spectacles which characterized Roman civic life.[4] The games and their attendant rituals were impressive religious and ceremonial occasions that helped to reaffirm the existing order by forging a bond between the emperor, the leading men of the empire, and the inhabitants of the cities.[5] While the games in general helped to support the existing political and cosmic order, the theatre itself served as a vehicle for the inculcation of classical culture and values. It was largely from the theatre that the common folk learned mythology.[6] The most popular theatrical performances of the imperial period were pantomimes, farces, and mimes. The principal form of comedy was the mime whose subject matter came from every day urban life as well as myths. Virtually all of the theatrical conventions of the early drama disappeared in the mimes. Actresses, *mimae*, now played the female roles. Discarding the traditional masks and costumes that had been an integral part of the theatre from its origins, performers wore the contem-

---

[3] A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First: an Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), 395.

[4] J.P.D.V. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure at Rome* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), 267-68; Paul Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque* (Paris: Seuil, 1976) 15; Claude Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Alfrique romaine au bas empire* (2 vols.; Paris: Etudes augustiniennes, 1979), 1.210, 299; S.R.F. Price, *Ritual and Power: The Roman imperial court in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 101, 127-128; and Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (1st ed.; London: Duckworth, 1977), 39.

[5] Price, *Ritual* and Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 193-196 discuss the role that ritual plays in legitimating the political order.

[6] Blake Leyerle, *Ascetic Pantomime: John Chrysostom Against Spiritual Marriage* (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1991), 47. See also Minos Kokolakis, "Pantomimus and the Treatise περὶ Ὀρχήσεως," *Platon* 10-11 (1958-59), 21.

porary dress of the towns where they performed.[7] While the mimes and pantomimes were crowd pleasers, there were among the conservative educated elite those, like Seneca, whose Stoic attitudes led them to condemn the performances as grossly degenerate art forms. These men bewailed the fact that people who attended the *ludi scaenici* absorbed all that was inferior and degraded.[8]

The acting profession was made up of people who sprang from the full spectrum of Roman society—from the upper echelons of the senatorial class, free born persons, freedmen and women, and slaves.[9] It was not uncommon for Roman nobles, including the emperor himself, to own their own personal theatrical troop of slaves. There were even a few illustrious stage performers who traveled with large entourages including their privately owned theatrical troop of slaves. These troops might perform for the select entertainment of their owners or be rented out for festive events—including the public spectacles.[10] Other troops, composed of free-born and/or freedmen stage artists, formed theatrical guilds and in this capacity negotiated performance contracts with individuals and cities. Some acting guilds established special relations with rulers who became their patrons. These troops often held guild meetings and banquets in the temples dedicated to state gods.[11]

---

[7] Margaret Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theatre* (2d ed. rev.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 422; Joan Liversidge, *Everyday Life in the Roman Empire* (London: B.T. Botsford, 1976), 95; Ludwig Friedlaender, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire* (trans. J. Freese and L. Magnus; 4 vols.; New York: Barnes & Nobel, 1968), 2. 100.

[8] Lucian *De salt.* 2-3; See Dorothea French, *Christian Emperors and Pagan Spectacles: The Secularization of the Ludi A.D. 382-525* (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1985). See also Leyerle, "Ascetic Pantomimes," 80-81.

[9] Digest 23.2.47 Paul, *Lex Julia et Papia, book 2* states that a senator's daughter who has been a prostitute or an actress or convicted of a criminal offense can safely marry a freedman, because a woman who has behaved so disgracefully has no honor left. "*Senatoris filia, quae corpore quaestum uel artem ludicram fecerit aut iudicio publico damnata fuerit, impune libertino nubit: nec enim honos ei seruatur, quae se in tantum foedus deduxit.*"

[10] Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 7.24.1-5 says that Ummidia Quadratilla, an elderly patrician widow of independent means, kept a troupe of pantomime actors whom she treated with an indulgence unsuitable in a lady of her high position. The troop performed privately in her home and in the public theatre. See Allardyce Nicoll, *Masks, Mimes and Miracles: Studies in the Popular Theatre* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1963), 98-99; 108-09 for other examples.

[11] The most well known is the Artists of Dionysius. See E.J. Jory, "Associations of Actors in Rome," *Hermes* 98 (1970), 244-53 and Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *The*

Thus within the acting community there was a broad spectrum of theatrical performers from slave to free-born, from second-rate to the widely acclaimed and celebrated super stars. Some male performers benefited socially from their popularity by receiving appointments to civic priesthoods thereby gaining the right to offer public spectacles themselves in honor of the emperor. A few even made their way into the imperial household.[12] Beautiful and talented actresses not only acquired great personal wealth, they became trend-setters for Roman matrons who imitated the clothing, makeup and mannerism of the best known stage personalities. A good example of such public adulation is the actress Cytheris, paramour of Marc Anthony, who went about carried in an open litter preceded by laurel-crowned lictors, enjoying the attention of civic officials who hurried out to greet her whenever she approached a town. The council and people of Taormina, Sicily, erected a funeral stele in honor of another actress, the "radiant Julia Bassilla," praising her for "her art, her virtue, and her wisdom."[13] Official civic honors of this sort and a general public adulation obscure the reality of the sorry legal position of the acting profession in Roman society.

Actresses, particularly the most celebrated, were simultaneously lionized for their talent and beauty, and looked down upon in status conscious Roman society because of the legal disdain in which their profession was held. According to Roman law actresses were classed with prostitutes as *humiles abiectaeque personae* as it was assumed that both prostitutes and actresses earned money by selling sexual favors.[14] The cultural construct of the actress as a seductress assumed that to act was a form of prostitution, a selling

---

Dramatic Festivals of Athens (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 304-5. Pickard-Cambridge cites *Oxryh. Pap.* 2476, p. 171 (289 C.E.) in which Aurelius Hatres, the high priest of the Artists of Dionysius, sends a notice to the emperor advising him of the good will and honor in which the ruler was held, and reminding him of the "exemption from taxes and liturgies" which Aurelius was entitled by virtue of this position.

[12] LS 5186. Pylades, the greatest pantomime of his time was honored by the people of Puteoli for his generous games. The right to give these *munera* had been granted by Commodius Pius Felix Augustus. See A. Müller, "Die Parasiti Apollinis," *Philologus* 63 (1904), 342-361.

[13] Georgius Kaibel, ed., *Inscriptiones Italiae et Siciliae*, vol. 14 Inscriptiones Graecae (Berolini Apud Georgium Reimerum, 1890), 1091. "Τὴν ἐπὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ σωφροσύνῃ τε καὶ σοφίᾳ διαπρέπουσαν Ἰαλλίαν Βασσιανὴ[ν] vel Βάσσιλλ[αν] Βου[λὴ] καὶ δῆμος τῆς λαμπρᾶς π[όλε]ως Ταυρομενειτῶν ἀνέ[στη]σεν τὴν λαμπροτάτην."

[14] Digest 23.2.44; Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law & Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 129, 246-247; Balsdon, *Life*, 280.

of the self in a desire to seduce the audience. No doubt the public forum also provided women who were so inclined with the opportunity to solicit customers.[15] There was an important legal distinction, however, between prostitutes who earned their entire income from selling their bodies and actresses whose principle source of income came from appearing on the stage and only secondarily from prostitution. Actresses suffered less social and legal stigma than prostitutes. Nevertheless, women in both professions shared a condition of permanent degradation. According to Roman law some conditions were inherent (permanent degradation) and other conditions were not. Certain occupations, such as acting and prostitution, rendered the people engaged in them permanently infamous. Even if they left their profession women retained this legal ignominy.[16] The rationale behind the law was that people engaged in these occupations had an inferiority of character so inherent that it never could be lessened and could, moreover, even be transmitted to their offspring.[17] The appeal of the theatrical profession, however, was attractive enough that freeborn men and women, including women from the senatorial class, willingly chose a career in the theatre despite the legal and social implications for themselves and their offspring.[18]

It may have been in an effort to restore the luster to patrician families that Augustus's family legislation of 9 C.E., *leges Iulia et Papia Poppaea*, codified social custom by explicitly forbidding all free-born persons, including senators, from marrying infamous persons or their offspring. The law specifically

---

[15] Mary Louise Roberts, "Acting Up: The Feminist Theatrics of Marguerite Durant," *French Historical Studies* 19:4 (Fall 1996), 110.

[16] See David Daube, "The Marriage of Justinian and Theodora. Legal and Theological Reflections," *Catholic University Law Review* 16 (1967), 383 who notes that Caligula's tax on all harlots, whether active or retired, was based on the assumption that the character of a prostitute does not change even after she retires.

[17] For example with regard to prostitution Digest 23.2.43.1 Ulpian states that the law brands with *infamia* not just the woman who practices prostitution but also anyone who has done so in the past, even though she no longer behaves in this way; the disgrace is not removed by stopping the behaviour. Daube, "Marriage," 381-383.

[18] Digest 23.2.44.6-7 explicitly addresses the fate of freeborn women who become associated with the stage after their marriage. Digest 23.2.44.6 says that if either the father or mother of a freeborn woman begins to practice the profession of the stage after their daughter has contracted a marriage she would not be repudiated by her husband. However, according to Digest 23.2.44.7, if a married woman chose to appear on stage after her marriage her husband should repudiate her. These ruling suggest that freeborn men and women had the freedom to choose the theatrical profession, a profession moreover that had serious legal consequences for themselves and their offspring.

prohibited a senator, his son, or his grandson, or his great-grandson by his son from marriage with a freedwoman, or a woman who is or has been an actress or whose father or mother are or have been actors (*quae ipsa cuiusue pater materue artem ludicram facit fecerit*). Similarly the daughter of a senator, his granddaughter by his son, or great-granddaughter by his grandson was forbidden to marry a man who is or has been an actor or whose father or mother is or has been an actor.[19] Since according to Roman practice one of the primary functions of marriage was the production of legitimate children, Roman legal discussion of marriage often focuses on the question of the status of children. The prohibition against marriage with actors and actresses also forbids marriage with their offspring since they inherited their mother's status. Unless both parents were full Roman citizens enjoying the rights of formal Roman marriage, and linked in such a marriage, the children of such a union would follow the status of the mother.[20] Any children issuing from a union between an actress and a patrician would be illegitimate, *iniusti*, since the union would be void at law. The offspring were not *in patria potestate* and had no rights of intestate succession to their father.[21] Throughout the empire laws continued to reiterate the Roman social ideal of maintaining the exclusive legal and social position of the senatorial class by prohibiting marriage with theatrical performers, or offering them the protection of the status of concubine.[22] The reiteration of Augustus's marriage prohibitions from the first century through the time of Justinian, when they were included in his codification of Roman law, suggests both the continuity of the Augustan family ideal in law and the difficulty of enforcing it throughout the empire.

There is often a discrepancy between social practice and legal idealism

---

[19] Augustus's first great piece of legislation was the *Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* of 18 B.C.E. It was followed by the *Lex Papia Poppaea* in 9 C.E. The law as it stood from that date is generally cited as the Julian and Papian Law. Digest 23.2.44 Paul (*Lex Julia et Papia, book 1*). Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 82. Susan Treggiari, *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 60.

[20] P.R.C. Weaver, "Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)," in Beryl Rawson, ed., *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 174.

[21] Dixon, *Family*, 91.

[22] David I, Kertzer, "The Role of Ritual in Political Change," in Myron J. Aronoff, ed., *Culture and Political Change* vol. 1 Political Anthropology Yearbook (2 vols., New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1983), 58. He notes that the more privileged the position enjoyed by a group, the more eager it will be to exclude people from less privileged positions from its ranks.

particularly in the realm of sex and gender where the norms of practice and the norms of ideology typically operate in a state of conflict, ambiguity and tension. There was no single Roman attitude toward adultery, sexuality or women, or even a uniform attitude of the Roman elite toward these matters. The sources reflect the complexity of the conceptualizations of sexuality among individuals and even within some individuals in different contexts.[23] The reiteration of marriage laws prohibiting actresses or their daughters from marrying into the senatorial class suggest that at least some members of the social elite were perfectly willing to overlook an actress's legal inferiority, particularly if she was extraordinarily talented or lovely, and offer her the respectability of marriage or concubinage. It would be less scandalous perhaps if she herself had never appeared on the stage but had been born to parents from a patrician or freeborn family which had chosen a theatrical career. Nevertheless she shared her family's legal infamy even if she sprang from a notable theatrical clan. There is nothing in the sources to suggest, however, that such marriage alliances were commonplace since they represented a dramatic breach in traditional Mediterranean social ideals which placed a high premium on the chastity of wives. A virtuous woman would bring honor to a family. In a society where female chastity was judged according to a politics of reputation, a woman's private sexual conduct rested on inferences from her public behavior.[24] In contrast it would be presumed that the sexual and reproductive potential of a woman of the stage, whose bodily charms had been the object of the male gaze and the focus of public discussion, would not belong exclusively to her husband.[25] Indeed the law specifically states that chastity was expected only of those women who were in a lawful relationship and as such counted as matrons.[26]

As inheritors of Stoic ethical attitudes and Roman social and legal prejudice against theatrical performers, early Christian leaders wrestled with the problem of permitting actors and actresses to convert and join the community of believers. Men like Cyprian were particularly sensitive to preserving boundaries and markers of the Christian community which were more strict than those of Roman society. If marriage with theatrical performers

---

[23] David Cohen, "The Augustan Law on Adultery: The Social and Cultural Context," in David I. Kertzer and Richard P. Saller, eds., *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 112, 122-123.

[24] Cohen, "Adultery," 113.

[25] Cohen, "Adultery," 112.

[26] C.J. 9.9.28 (Constantius, 326 C.E.).

would contaminate the blood of the senatorial class, how much more would the admission of people of infamous status to the Christian community pollute that body? In reply to a question posed to him about the permissibility of an actor communicating with the congregation of Thena, Cyprian replied that theatrical performers could not be baptized unless they left their profession. He argued that the respect and honor of the church would be defiled by the base and infamous contamination, *turpi et infami contagione*, of an actor. The bishop was not impressed by the fact that the man had already left the stage and was supporting himself by teaching acting. According to Cyprian the actor ought to be rescued from his depravity and shame, *pravitate et dedecore.* By teaching others how to act he was substituting proxies, *vicarios*, to appear for himself, and was instructing them in a shameless art which was contrary to the plan of God. If it became necessary, said the bishop, the man ought to be supported with offerings from the congregation.[27] Cyprian's attitude reflects the continuity of the cultural and legal prejudice of a small group of the educated elite against the stage and everything connected with it.

However his views also illustrate the fundamental difference in the attitude of Roman society and the Christian community. Like followers of Stoic philosophy Christian leaders saw the theatre as morally corrupt, but unlike Roman jurists they did not see theatrical performers themselves as permanently degraded. This radical attitude toward the status of theatrical performers rested upon the belief that Christian baptism was a symbolic death and rebirth which stripped away the permanent degradation attached to actors and actresses.[28] They, like all Christians, were now "neither Jew nor Greek . . . slave nor free . . . male nor female . . . but one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:27-28)[29] Christianity offered spiritual redemption for those people whose former connection with the theatre continued to render them legally ignoble within the wider Roman society. Cyprian's objections to the actor rested not on his ignoble status but on his connection with an idolatrous institution.

---

[27] Cyprian, *Ep.* 61 to Eucratius, Bishop of Thena. J.-P. Migne, PL 8, 362-363. See also *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage*, translated and annotated by G.W. Clarke (New York: Newman Press, 1984), 53.

[28] Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 155. See also Jack P. Lewis, "Baptismal Practices of the Second and Third Century Church," *Restoration Quarterly* 26 no. 1 (1983), 4-5.

[29] See especially Peter Brown, *Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 49-50.

The rite of baptism itself contained a contract of renunciation which illustrates the church's fundamentally negative attitude toward the theatre itself. Priests required catechumens to repeat the phrase, "I renounce thee, Satan, thy pomps, thy service, and thy works . . . and I enter into thy service, O Christ."[30] From the second century onward the Fathers of the Church had interpreted this phrase to mean the renunciation of the public spectacles and their *pompae*, the processions of civic deities. "When we enter the water and profess the Christian faith in terms prescribed by its law," writes Tertullian "we profess with our mouths that we have renounced the devil, his pomp and his angels (*renuntiasse nos diabolo et pompae et angelis eius*). . . . So if it shall be established that the whole equipment of the public shows is idolatry pure and simple, we have an indubitable decision laid down in advance, that this profession of renunciation made in baptism touches the public shows too, since they are serving the devil, his pomp and angels, namely by way of idolatry." (*Igitur si ex idololatria uniuersam spectaculorum paraturam constare constiterit, indubitate praeiudicatum erit et iam ad spectacula pertinere renuntiationis nostrae testimonium in lauacro, quae diabolo et pompae et angelis eius sint mancipata, scilicet per idololatrian.*)[31] The fact that Tertullian had to point out the idolatrous nature of the games to catechumens suggests, as have recent ritual studies, that the symbols and rituals associated with public ceremonies provided a wide latitude of interpretation for participants.[32]

While symbolism is important in uniting disparate groups, "most symbolic action, even the basic symbols of a community's ritual life, can be very unclear to participants or interpreted by them in very dissimilar ways."[33] The lack of clarity is apparent in the conflicting attitudes toward the public spectacles within the Christian community. Tertullian and the more ascetically minded Fathers viewed everything connected with the theatre as idolatrous. However, the silent majority of Christians saw the public

---

[30] Antoine Wenger, A.A., *Jean Chrysostome: Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites*, vol. 50 Sources Crétiennes (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1957) 2.20-21. "'Αποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, καὶ τῇ πομπῇ σου καὶ τῇ λατρείᾳ σου καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις σου." See also *St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions*, Trans. Paul W. Harkins (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1963), 2.20-21, 11.25.

[31] Tertullian *de Spect.*, 4.1 [*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, Vol. I (Turnholti: Brepols, 1954) p. 231]. See also *Tertullian: Disciplinary, Moral and Ascetical Works*, trans. Rudolph Arbesmann, O.S.A., Sister Emily Joseph Daly, C.S.J., Edwin A. Quain, S.J. (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1959), 56-57 and *Apol.* 38.4.

[32] Bell, *Ritual*, 183 and 191.

[33] Bell, *Ritual*, 183.

spectacles as an integral aspect of Roman society and part of their cultural heritage.[34] Some Christians from the leading class even held the office of *flamen*, an imperial priesthood requiring the holder to officiate over the public sacrifices associated with civic celebrations of the state gods. In reaction to this liberal attitude the canons of the Council of Elvira in A.D. 300 declared that those who were guilty of offering traditional sacrifices as part of their compulsory public service as *flamines* were to be excommunicated without hope of pardon, even on their deathbeds.[35]

The willingness of Christians not only to attend the public spectacles but to preside over them reflects the degree to which many Christians, especially in the Greek world, viewed themselves no longer as a sect ranged against Roman civilization. On the contrary, by the third century they had reached an accommodation with Greek culture enabling them to assimilate pagan culture into a Christian framework. This new outlook, according to Peter Brown, was one of the most decisive changes within the Christian community since it facilitated the Christianization of Rome by enabling pagans and Christians to share a common cultural heritage.[36]

Nevertheless, in spite of the widespread acceptance of the public spectacles by the majority of Christians, until the last quarter of the fourth century the church officially remained hostile to the games. John Chrysostom's instructions to baptismal candidates sound remarkably like Tertullian's when the former wrote: "Let us say these words, 'I renounce thee Satan,' knowing that we shall be called to account for them on that day of judgement. And the pomps of the devil are the theatres, the racecourses, every sinful observance of days, presages contained in chance utterances and omens."[37] Other leading figures in both the East and West, including Sozomen,

---

[34] Robert Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 199), 27-30; Renee Salzman, *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 226-228. Both Salzman and Markus recognize the danger in dividing late antique culture into pagan and Christian as did the Fathers. They continue, however, to follow the Durkheimian model of labeling public institutions and rituals as either religious or secular. In light of recent ritual studies which are challenging the traditional association of belief and ritual it may be more helpful to abandon this analytical model which the more uncompromising Fathers utilized.

[35] Lepelley, *Les cités*, 362.

[36] Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity A.D. 150-750* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989), 82; Salzman, *Time*, 21.

[37] Chrysostom *Bapt. Inst.* 12.52 and 11.215. See also Leonel L. Mitchell, "The Baptismal Rite in Chrysostom," *Anglican Theological Review* 43 (1961), 399.

Gregory Nazianzen, Jacob of Sarugh, Ambrose, and Augustine roundly condemned the theatre. Major councils and decrees of the church repeatedly charged the faithful to abandon the theatre or face ecclesiastical sanction.[38]

It was not only the public spectacles in general which came under attack by the Church Fathers. Actresses in particular became the object of vitriolic denunciations of the theatre by such stern moralists as Chrysostom. Actresses came to symbolize everything that was wrong with the theatre. Chrysostom's criticisms of actresses illustrates the continuity of the classical construct of a woman of the stage as a dangerous seductress—the very antithesis of a chaste Roman and Christian matron.[39] The vivid and detailed descriptions of her flowing tresses and khol-blackened eyes sparkling with charm as she sang audacious love songs and satirical couplets reveal a male aesthetic of the actress as an *object d'art* which is simultaneously desired and feared.[40] The audiences were filled with men from all social and economic backgrounds who would be willing to throw away familial and societal restraints in the competition to possess such an exquisitely tantalizing creature. According to Chrysostom the most talented women of the stage attracted large followings of love-struck admirers who squandered their family resources by showering the actresses with costly perfumes, jewels and other gifts.[41] His denunciations reflect the underlying anxiety that actresses posed a real threat to the family in one way or another. It is not surprising that the church continued to demand that both actresses and actors leave the stage and all of its negative associations if they wanted to

---

[38] Marguerite Harl, "Le dénonciation des festivités profanes dans le discours épiscopal et monastique, en Orient Chrétien à la fin du IV^{e} siècle," in *La Fête pratique et discours: d'Alexandrie hellenistique á la Mission de Besançon* 262 Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981), 133. See Leyerle, "Ascetic Pantomimes," 51-52 for a full treatment of this subject.

[39] Peter Brown, "East and West: The New Marital Morality," in Paul Veyne, ed., *A History of Private Life: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 297-311.

[40] Roberts, "Acting Up," 1110. See also Debora Silverman, *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-Siècle France: Politics, Psychology, and Style* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1989), 70.

[41] Chrysostom Hom. 19 *in John.* PG 59, 1020; *Hom. contra ludos et theatra,* PG 56, 266, 267, 543; See also Georgios J. Theochardis, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Profantheaters im IV. und V. Jahrhundert, hauptsaechlich auf grund der Predigten des Johannes Chrysostomos, Patriarchen von Konstinople* (Thessaloniki: Druckerei M. Treantaphyllou, 1940), 69-70. Chrysostom's sermons are a continuity of earlier diatribes such as those of Tertullian and Cyprian of Carthage directed against women's dress, makeup and jewelry by which they led men astray. See Averil Cameron, "Discourse of Female Desire," 153-156; and Cloke, *Female,* 28.

convert. Moreover, by this time the Christian community had adopted the Roman legal prejudice against marriage to actresses. Men who were married to former actresses were not eligible to become clergymen or to advance to the office of bishop.[42]

By the end of the fourth century the unalterable opposition of the more ascetically minded Christian leaders to the public spectacles appears to have had a significant influence on late fourth century imperial policy toward the complex problem faced by those theatrical performers for whom acting was a compulsory public service.[43] Actors and actresses who fell into this category did not have the option of leaving the stage as the church continued to require. Acknowledging that a conflict existed between the imperial need for a steady supply of theatrical performers and church canons denying baptism to working actors and actresses, Christian emperors issued edicts setting forth the conditions under which theatrical performers might obtain permission to leave the stage in order to become baptized. While recognizing that doctrine was to be decided by ecclesiastical councils, Christian rulers controlled many ecclesiastical affairs as a part of general civil government. Therefore edicts addressing the conversion of theatrical performers were addressed to the praetorian prefects whose duty it was to enforce them.[44]

---

[42] By the early fourth century the influence of monasticism and the general exaltation of the ascetic life above the social, and of celibacy above the married state, together with the increasing sharpness of the distinction between clergy and laity, all tended toward the celibacy of the clergy. In the practice of clerical celibacy, however, the Greek and Latin churches diverged in the fourth century. The Greek church limited the injunction of celibacy to the higher clergy. In the East, one marriage was always allowed to the clergy, and at first even to bishops, and celibacy was left optional. Yet certain restrictions were early introduced, such as the prohibition of marriage after ordination, as well as of second marriage after baptism. Besides second marriage, the marrying of a concubine, a widow, a harlot, a slave, or an actress, was forbidden to the clergy. A man who was married to a woman from this category could not be advanced to the office of bishop. See Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* vol. 3 Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1910), 242-250.

[43] In addition to slaves there were women of the lower class "*ex viliori sorte progenitae*" who were obligated to the compulsory performance of the spectacles "*spectaculorum debentur obsequiis*" as described in C.Th. 15.7.4 (380 C.E.). Similarly the daughter of theatrical parents who appeared to be living a vulgar life (*vulgarem vitam*) was obligated to appear on stage according to C.Th. 15.7.2 (371 C.E.). C.J. 5.27.1 (336 C.E.) applies to women of the stage whether they engaged in the profession by their own authority or because of an imperial rescript. See also Nicoll, *Masks*, 98-99; 108-109 and Jory, "Associations," 244-53.

[44] J.B. Bury, *History of the later Roman empire from the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian* (A.D. 395 to A.D. 565) (2 vols., New York: Dover), 2.360-62.

C.Th. 15.7.1 (371 C.E.) is the first rescript to address the issue of the baptism of actors and actresses. In it Viventius, prefect of the city, is admonished to make it possible for those performers who were *in extremis* to seek the sacrament of baptism. In acknowledgement of the church's position that baptism meant the renunciation of their profession, the edict stipulated that the prefect was to take utmost care to ensure that the theatrical performers were not feigning the gravity of their illness. Both ecclesiastical and secular officials were to be brought in to assess the situation. Stage artists were permitted to receive the sacraments on their deathbeds only with the bishop's approval. Requests for the sacraments, however, had to be reported immediately to the *judices*, or if they were absent, to the *curators* of the cities so that inspectors might be sent to investigate the legitimacy of the request.[45] Clearly theatrical performers were a resource that the emperors felt they could not squander, and it is apparent the prefect could not rely on the testimony of a bishop alone. In recognition of the church's teaching that actors and actresses must leave their profession after baptism, however, the edict states that those stage performers who survived would receive an imperial exemption from their obligatory public service to appear on stage.

The imperial edict reflects both widespread practice and the official ecclesiastical attitude toward baptism by the late fourth century. Most catechumens were unwilling to undergo baptism until they reached old age or were on their deathbeds.[46] Those who wished to undergo baptism before their deathbed looked upon conversion as the complete renunciation of one way of life and the adoption of another. For example, men such as Paulinus of Nola, and an impressive number of his circle of friends, gave up wealth and their military or civic careers for the rigors of monastic life after baptism.[47]

The imperial rescript implying that *mimae* put off baptism until their deathbeds denied them the opportunity for both social and legal redemption. Because actresses were permanently infamous their baptism and adoption of a new way of life would not have altered their legal status within the wider Roman society. Therefore the terms of a new rescript C.Th. 15.7.4, promulgated in 380 C.E. and again in 381 in a slightly different format

---

[45] C.Th. 15.7.1 [371 or 367 C.E.].

[46] Brown, *Augustine*, 106-7. See also Lewis, "Baptismal," 14.

[47] *Letters of Paulinus of Nola*, trans. and annot. P.G. Walsh, Ancient Christian Writers: the works of the Fathers in translation, nos. 35-36 (2 vols., Westminster, Maryland: Newmann Press, 1966-67), 1.5.4.

as C.Th. 15.7.9, offered an unprecedented opportunity for converted actresses to become legally respectable. Under its terms actresses who wished to leave the stage in the name of Christianity, *consideratio sacratissimae religionis et Christianae legis reverentia*, could request a release from their compulsory public service. Furthermore this imperial grant removed all legal prejudice and stigma attached to the woman's former occupation. (*Illas etiam feminas liberas a contubernio scaenici praeiudicii durare praecipimus, quae Mansuetudinis nostrae beneficio, expertes muneris turpioris esse meruerunt.*) C.Th. 15.7.4 and 9 meant that actresses who converted now had the possibility of living for the first time free of legal and social ignominy within the wider Roman community, and implies the removal of all barriers to marriage which they had faced since Augustus's marriage laws.[48] The removal of all legal prejudice and stigma attached to the woman's former occupation was a Christian application of an imperial prerogative in effect since the late second century giving rulers the right to grant freedmen the opportunity to have all blemish of their servile origins erased. The legal concept was undoubtedly influenced by Stoic philosophy which taught that in a past golden age all men were born free. Under the terms of the grant of freebornship the individual was returned to his natural birthright, *natales restituere.* Such a person became legally a free person "as if he had never been a slave."[49] The rescripts of 380/381 C.E. relating to the conversion of actresses appear to suggest a Christian legal parallel with the case of slaves although there is no explicit suggestion that these women were granted the right of *natales restituere.*

The edicts exempting women from appearing on the stage are completely riveted on the social construct of the actress as a sexually promiscuous individual. Indeed the laws specifically refer to the profession as one of indecent character (*muneris turpioris*).[50] It is not surprising, therefore,

---

[48] See C.Th. 15.7.9 (381 C.E.) for virtually the same wording.

[49] Codex 6.8.2, 294 C.E. "*natalibus autem antiquis restituti liberti ingenui nostro beneficio constituuntur.*" The concept of a free state of all under natural law is repeatedly affirmed by the later classics. Institutes 1.2.2 states "For by natural law, at the beginning, all men were born free." (*iure enim naturali ab initio omnes homines liberi nascebantur.*) For a full discussion of the topic see David Daube, "Greek and Roman Reflections on Impossible Laws," *Natural Law Forum* 12 (1967), 61-70.

[50] C.Th. 15.7.4 and 9 "if they have obtained exemption from this compulsory public service of an indecent (*turpioris*) character by a special grant of imperial favor of Our Clemency." C.Th. 7.2 protects daughters of theatrical performers "provided that they so conduct themselves that they should be considered worthy persons (*ut probabiles habeantur*)." However, those who appear to have lived a vulgar life (*vulgarem vitam*) ought to be recalled to the theatre.

that another rescript from the same time (C.Th. 15.7.8 [381 C.E.]) stipulates that a woman of the stage (*scenae mulier*) who had received an imperial exemption on the basis of her Christianity must make a clean break with her earlier life. A former actress could lose her imperial exemption if she became sexually suspect—by becoming involved in indecent embraces (*turpibus volutata complexibus*), or if she remained a woman of the stage in spirit (*animo tamen scenica.*) The fate of such a relapsed woman was to be dragged back to the stage (*detracta in pulpitum*), there to remain forever without any hope of absolution. The loss of her imperial exemption could never be reversed even when she became a ridiculous old woman, unsightly through old age who had no choice but to be chaste (*donec anus ridicula, senectute deformis, nec tunc quidem absolutione potiatur, cum aliud quam casta esse non possit*).[51] The converted actress then was expected to be a completely new creature who had left all of the immoral associations of her former life.

The wording of the edicts conjures up images of the two stock female characters of the mimical stage familiar to Roman theatre-goers: the beautiful young actress who played the leading female role and the comic old bawd—a hag-like woman whose disreputable past had left its devastating mark on her ravaged physical appearance and unpredictable temperament.[52] The disturbing sensuality of the former stands in stark contrast to the ridiculous sexuality of the latter. The imperial exemption suggested that for actresses, like other converts in the late fourth century whose baptism signified a complete break with the past, conversion meant the renunciation of sexuality.[53]

The conversion of a *mima* and her renunciation of the public spotlight for an ascetic life was possible for some women only after the publication of C.Th. 15.7.4. This edict provides the historical and political context for an anecdote in St. Chrysostom's homily 67 *On St. Matthew.* According to Chrysostom an unnamed actress had come to Antioch from a city in Phoenicia and a large number of men had already ruined themselves

---

[51] C.Th. 15.7.8 (A.D. 381) "*Scaenae mulier si vacationem religionis nomine postularit, obtentu quidem petitionis venia ei non desit, verum si post, turpibus volutata complexibus, et religionem, quam expetierit, prodidisse et gerere, quod officio desierat, animo tamen scaenica detegetur, retracta in pulpitum, sine spe absolutionis ullius ibi eo usque permaneat, donec anus ridicula, senectute deformis, nec tunc quidem absolutione potiatur, cum aliud quam casta esse non possit.*"

[52] Nicole, *Masks*, 93.

[53] Brown, *Body and Society, passim* discusses the practice of permanent sexual renunciation—continence, celibacy, and life-long virginity—that developed in Christian circles from the first to the fifth centuries C.E.

financially in order to impress her. Despite the opposition of her admirers the actress resolved to convert. After her baptism she lived in austerity wearing a hair shirt.[54] Chrysostom may have completely fabricated the story of the converted actress, nevertheless it would have had a certain ring of authenticity for congregrations in late fourth century Syria. By repudiating every connection with her former way of life the penitent actress in Chrysostom's sermon exemplified not only Christian canons that actresses leave their profession after baptism, but also fulfilled the spirit of the imperial edict. By giving up the luxurious and ostentatious gowns of a woman of ill repute and adopting the hair shirt of a chaste ascetic the anonymous actress's choice of clothing was an outward symbol of the dramatic change in her sexual identity.[55] Stories of converted actresses gained popularity and circulated widely in the Empire. For a brief time Christianity offered actresses an unprecedented opportunity for both spiritual and social redemption.

By A.D. 392 Christian emperors had severed their last ties to the imperial cult and had substituted Christianity as the sole source of imperial religious legitimation.[56] This action paved the way for the absorption of Christianity into civic life that would become the hallmark of Byzantine society. Divested of all overt links with paganism and infused with imperial Christian symbolism, the public spectacles continued to thrive under Christian rulers.[57] A number of edicts dating from the turn of the fifth

---

[54] Chrysostom Hom 67 *in Matt.*, PG 58, 636-37.

[55] John Anson, "The Female Transvestite in Early Monasticism: The Origin and Development of a Motif," *Viator* 5 (1974), 1-32; Elizabeth A. Clark, *Women in the Early Church* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1983), 17-24; Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Life of Melania, the Younger* (New York: E. Mellen Press, 1984), 155; Eva Catafygiotu Topping, "Thekla the Nun: in Praise of Woman," GOTR 25 (Winter 1980), 353-370; Khalifa Abubakr Bennasser, *Gender and Sanctity in Early Byzantine Monasticism: A Study of the Phenomenon of Female Ascetics in Male Monastic Habit, with a translation of the Life of St. Matrona* (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1983), 31, 40-44, 60-67, 71-73; Elizabeth Castelli, "I Will Make Mary Male: Pieties of the Body and Gender Transformations of Christian Women in Late Antiquity," in Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub, eds., *Body Guards: the cultural politics of gender and ambiguity* (London/New York: Routledge, 1991), 33-35; 43-44; Kerstin Bjerre-Aspegren, *The Male Woman: A Feminine Ideal in the Early Church*, Renee Kieffer, ed. (Uppsala, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Stockholm, Sweden: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1990), 14-15, 79-82, 103-108, 133-140.

[56] French, "Christian Emperors," 29.

[57] French, "Christian Emperors," 63-70. C.Th. 8.7.21-22; 12.1.145; 14.7.13. See also Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the*

century demonstrate a conscious imperial attitude to make the public games less offensive to strict Christian moralists. The newly reorganized spectacles became inextricably identified with the most sacred Christian rulers, appointed by God as the protectors of the faithful and the champions of orthodoxy.[58] This accommodation to Christian sentiment raised the fundamental issue of what constituted the basis for an exemption from the stage. Certainly from an imperial viewpoint early Christian opposition to the games on the grounds of "idolatry" were no longer valid. Theodosius and Honorius may have reasoned that there was no reason to exempt actresses from their compulsory public service since they would be providing entertainment for an increasingly Christianized society under the supervision of Christian bureaucrats. C.Th. 15.7.13 (413/14 C.E.) commissions Diogenianus, Tribune of Amusements in Carthage, to recall to the stage all those actresses who previously had received an immunity from compulsory public service in the theatre. The legal, social, and religious implications of the repeal of C.Th. 15.7.4 for a former actress and for the empire at large were certainly enormous. Presumably the woman's legal ignominity returned with the resumption of her theatrical career. This setback in the legal and social gains actresses had made is part of a broader trend as Christianity became absorbed into the wider Roman society. It supports earlier studies which suggest that in the fifth century there was a strong reaction to the gains women had made within the earlier Christian community and a return to traditional classical attitudes.[59]

As the number of converts to Christianity increased and martyrdom all but disappeared by the beginning of the fifth century, the concept of baptism also underwent profound changes. For example Cyril of Jerusalem opposed those who believed that baptism conferred only remission of sins, the classic view of baptism up to this time. He argued that it implied a share not only in Christ's death, but also his suffering. Thus the image of baptism as martyrdom expanded to include the daily martyrdom of the ascetic.[60] The association of baptism with the suffering of Christ placed the ascetic's body in the foreground for everyone to see and hear about, just as the confessor's death had done. Once sexual renunciation became the

---

Early Medieval West (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 100-111 for the Christianization of imperial victory celebrations in the Christian Roman empire.

[58] Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions*, 152-53.

[59] Harvey, *Asceticism and Society*, 113; Herrin, "Byzantine Women," 181-184.

[60] Gordon Jeanes, "Baptism Portrayed as Martyrdom in the Early Church," *Studia Liturgica* 23, no. 2 (1993), 167.

distinguishing mark of the ascetic vocation, converted actresses became one embodiment of the ideal of extreme physical asceticism as a type of martyrdom.[61] Prior to baptism these women were the personification of a blatant feminine sexuality which posed a threat to the Christian community. After baptism, according to the *topos*, the former actress shed her past completely and became the embodiment of heroic sexual renunciation.[62] Although the prototype for the converted prostitute was Mary Magdalene, undoubtedly hagiographers drew upon and reinterpreted the widely circulated stories of converted actresses.[63] Moreover, the hagiographers and their audience were all too aware of the prominence of beautiful and sexually alluring actresses in public life, and could call upon their own personal observations in enumerating in explicit detail the physical attraction of such women.

The self-styled "James the Deacon" or "Jacob" employed vivid imagery in describing the conversion of the actress Pelagia which he presents as a miracle in his life of Bishop Nonnos. Jacob describes her as a famous mimical actress whose body became a battleground for opposing forces as evidenced by her clothing.[64] Before her conversion the actress's flagrant sexuality was immediately obvious. Her extravagant clothes, makeup, and jewelry all proclaimed her status as a dangerous seductress. Jacob asserts that numerous young men had squandered their family fortunes in an attempt to gain her favor. This is the same image of the actress as seductress that lay behind C.Th. 15.7.8 and the sermons of John Chrysostom.

---

[61] Clark, *Women in Early Church*, 6 writes that once persecutions ceased in the early fourth century virginity replaced martyrdom as a means of showing extraordinary devotion to God. Therefore by leading an ascetic life one could imitate those who had gone to their deaths for the faith.

[62] Clark, *Women in Early Church*, 16; Cloke, *Female Man*, 57; Avril Cameron, "Female Desire," 160.

[63] Benedicta Ward, *Harlots of the Desert: A Study of Repentance in Early Monastic Sources* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), 1-21. Saphinaz-Amal Naguib, "The Martyr as Witness: Coptic and Copto-Arabic Hagiographies as Mediators of Religious Memory," *Numen* 41 (1994), 228 mentions how texts were recycled and adapted to the taste and mentality of the place and time. The theme of woman as the temptress runs through the *Lausiac History* of Palladius.

[64] Sebastian Brock and Susan Ashbrook Harvey, *Women of the Syrian Orient* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 40 discuss the difficulty of identifying bishop Nonnos. According to the author of the Life, Nonnos was a monk in Egypt, but his see is never named. Some scholars believe him to have been the Nonnos who was bishop of Edessa from 449-51 C.E. and 457-70/1 C.E. Brock and Harvey think this identification is unlikely, and suggest that the "suppression of details" by the hagiographer was deliberate since the Life was a "literary embellishment" of the story of the converted prostitute to whom Chrysostom refers.

Unlike the actresses in the fourth century imperial edict, however, Pelagia apparently had the freedom to leave her profession when she decided to convert. Jacob presents her baptism as signaling the beginning of a life of ascetic martyrdom when he describes how Pelagia shed the clothing of a high-class prostitute and voluntarily adopted the rough cloak of a hermit. Her selection of garments denoted her entrance into the rigorous ascetic life wherein, disguised as a man, she gained renown for her spirituality. For her, as for other ascetics, this new life meant the complete renunciation of sexuality.[65] According to the hagiographic *topos* it was only after her death that her true gender was discovered to the amazement of all. That a female, much less an actress/prostitute, could overcome her essentially sexual nature symbolized for Jacob the ultimate physical suffering. Sexual renunciation, like martyrdom, gave females an opportunity to rise above what Chrysostom considered to be the limitations of their sex.[66] For actresses the ascetic life offered the opportunity to opt out of a social framework in which one was permanently legally and socially degraded no matter how exemplary their life after their conversion. The Life of Pelagia became the paradigm for a whole cycle of extravagant romantic fables and romances associated with the names of Marina, Margaret, Euphrosyne and Theodora.[67]

It is unclear to what extent the lives of actress/ascetics reflect the acceptance of actresses within the wider Byzantine society. Their appearance as exemplars in the sixth century suggests, at the very least, that their conversion was no longer an issue within the Christian community. Hagiographers would not have selected *mimae* as models of the faith unless Christian audiences could accept the premise.[68] Moreover, the popularity of this topos reflects society's continuing fascination with women of the stage. Nevertheless these lives reveal the continuity of the social construct of the actress as a seductress who preyed upon impressionable young men. The hagiographers

---

[65] Brown, *Body and Society*. See also Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "Women in Early Byzantine Hagiography: Reversing the Story," in L. Coon, K. Haldane and E. Sommers, eds., *That Gentle Strength: Historical Perspectives on Women in Christianity* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1990), 36-59.

[66] Clark, *Women in Early Church*, 16.

[67] Pierre Petitmengin, "La diffusion de la <Pénitence de Pélagie>," *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés: IV^e^-XII^e^ siècle* (Paris: Etudes augustiniennes, 1981), 33-47 and *Pélagie la Pénitente, Métamorphoses d'une légende* (2 vols., Paris: Etudes augustiennes, 1981).

[68] Harvey, *Asceticism and Society*, xiii notes that the change in standard hagiographic themes reveal the "subconscious concerns of their societies and serve to establish a large sense of order for those whom they are written to guide."

were writing for audiences all too familiar with easily recognizable stock characters in mimic plays, and they swiftly and accurately characterized the actress's sexuality in broad strokes by describing her hair, makeup, jewelry, and clothing. On the other hand the lives of actress/ascetics might just as easily be interpreted as the Christian appropriation of popular stage characters. Instead of the flagrant sexuality of the *mimae*, audiences would be provided with a new stock character—a transvestite saint whose sexual identity remains a secret until after her death. Seen in this light the Lives perpetuate an unaltered ecclesiastical policy that insisted that conversion for actresses meant the complete rejection of all connection with the stage—including her sexuality. The texts glorify neither the theatre nor the acting profession and promote the ascetic ideal of civic and bodily renunciation. This message suggests that Christian ideology had no appreciable impact on the social and legal realities of early Byzantine actresses.[69] Even though the stage came under the supervision of a Christian secretary of the theatre, the pre-Christian concept persisted that there was something morally reprehensible about the acting profession and everyone engaged in it.

The elevation of Theodora, a former actress, to the imperial throne in the first quarter of the sixth century undoubtedly helped to stimulate an interest in Lives featuring converted actors and actresses.[70] The historical, as opposed to the fictional, Theodora raises fundamental questions about the status of former actresses who did not become ascetics after their conversion but who tried to live socially respectable lives. Although Theodora had renounced the stage and had become a committed Christian before she met Justinian she, like other former actress, still suffered all of the social and legal disabilities barring her from marriage with a patrician. Before she and Justinian could marry Theodora had to be freed from the permanent degradation associated with women of the stage. C.J. 5.4.23 passed in 520-23 C.E. by the emperor Justin, but undoubtedly influenced by his nephew Justinian, did just that.[71]

---

[69] Arjava, "Women in Christian Empire," 6-9 addresses this issue from another perspective.

[70] For Theodora see Averil Cameron, *Procopius and the sixth century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); H. DeLancker, *Théodora: impératrice d'Orient* (Paris: Hachette, 1968); Elizabeth A. Fisher, "Theodora and Antonia in the *Historia Arcana*: history and/or fiction?" *Arethusa* 11 (1978), 253-79 reprinted in J. Peradotto and J.P. Sullivan, eds., *Women in the Ancient world. The Arethusa Papers* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 287-313; and W.G. Holmes, *The Age of Justinian and Theodora: a history of the sixth century A.D.* (2 vols., London: 1912); and Daube, "Marriage," 380-399.

[71] Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, 2:29 contends that since Theodora had been made a

The primary intent of the rescript, however, was to pave the way for an actress to legally marry and not to remove her legal infamy. All of the provisions of the law explicitly link an imperial grant equivalent to the status of freebornhood with the right to contract a legal marriage with men whose social status had previously barred them from marriage with an actress or her daughter. By imperial degree successful petitioners no longer suffered permanent social and legal infamy. Indeed their past was completely obliterated (*direpta*) and they stood in a pristine legal state just as if (*quasi*) they had never previously led dishonorable lives (*nulla praecedente inhonesta vita.*) It followed that offspring, including daughters, from such unions were legitimate and could inherit their father's estate. Moreover, an actress's change in status also applied to any daughters she may have had prior to the imperial grant. Daughters who were born before the "purification" (*expurgationem*) of their mothers were permitted to petition the Emperor for a rescript by means of which they might be permitted to marry "just as if they were not the daughters of actresses" (*quasi non sint scaenicae matris filiae*). This is an important departure from Roman family law in which the legal status of children depended upon the status of their mother at the time each child was born.[72] In the past a subsequent change in a mother's status would have had no effect upon her offspring. According to the terms of C.J. 5.4.23, however, the daughter would be entitled to an imperial conferment of unrestricted marriage capacity.[73] The daughter of a working actress had to wait until her mother's demise before she could apply for an imperial grant to be free from the "blemish of her mother's reputation" (*liberationem maternae iniuriae*) and be granted permission to marry persons who "not long ago were prohibited from marrying the daughter of an actress" (*dudum scaenicae filiam uxorem ducere prohibebantur*). Finally, one of the last provisions of the rescript reiterates the marital intent of the law by stipulating that if the projected marriage failed to take place after the imperial grant the woman nevertheless retained her right of freebornhood.[74]

---

patrician some time before 524 she was eligible to marry a senator even if she had been on the stage. Daub, "Impossible Laws," 77-79 convincingly argues the contrary.

[72] P.R.C. Weaver, "Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)" in Beryl Rawson, ed., *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 174.

[73] Daube, "Marriage," 392. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage*, 311 notes that husbands did not regard themselves dishonored by their wives' misconduct. The third parties really effected by a woman's bad reputation are her children.

[74] C.J. 5.4.23.3 (*Sed etsi tales mulieres post divinum rescriptum ad preces earum datum ad matrimonium venire distulerint, salvam eis nihilo minus existimationem servari praecipimus tam in aliis omnibus quam ad transmittendam quibus voluerint suam substantiam et suscipiendam competentem sibi*

Clearly C.J. 5.4.23 was influenced by both the Christian concept of baptism as a rite which washed away one's past and made the convert a new creature and the Stoic concept of an ideal state of nature where all men were born free. Justinian baldly states that in granting former women of the stage the hope of improving their status he is following God's example. Since God is always willing to pardon the sins daily committed by men, accept their repentance, and bring them to a better condition, he writes, the ruler ought to imitate the benevolence of God, as far as his human nature would permit.[75] According to the terms of the rescript successful petitioners were in effect born again and returned to their native condition. The rescript states: "For all blemish having been utterly wiped out, and these women, so to speak, handed back to their native condition, we wish that neither shall a dishonorable designation henceforth attach to them nor shall they be any different from those who have committed no such sin." (*Nam omni macula penitus direpta et quasi suis natalibus huiusmodi mulieribus redditis neque vocabulum inhonestum eis inhaerere de cetero volumus neque differentiam aliquam eas habere cum his, quae nihil simile peccaverunt.*) Justinian clearly notes the parallel legal infamy between former slaves and women of the stage. It would be unjust to raise "slaves, to whom their liberty has been given," to the status of men who are born free, and place them in the same position "as if they had never been slaves, but were freeborn" (*quasi numquam deservissent, sed ingenui nati essent*) and deny hope of a better condition to "women who had devoted themselves to theatrical performances, and, afterwards having become disgusted with this degraded status, abandoned their infamous occupation and obtained better repute" (*mulieres autem, quae scaenicis quidem sese ludis immiscuerunt, postea vero spreta mala condicione ad meliorem migravere sententiam et inhonestam professionem effugerunt*).

A fundamental question of course is how many actresses and their daughters benefited from the rescript. It is unlikely the law would have been written if Justinian had not wanted to marry Theodora. No doubt a small and select number of women who had formed a potential marriage alliance

---

legibus ab aliis relictam vel ab intestato delatam hereditatem). "If, however, women of this description, after an Imperial Rescript has been granted them in accordance with their request, should defer contracting marriage, we order that their reputations shall, nevertheless, remain intact, as in the case of all others who may desire to transfer their property to anyone, in accordance with law, or an estate which may descend to them on the ground of intestacy."

[75] "*nam ita credimus dei benevolentiam et circa genus humanum nimiam clementiam quantum nostrae naturae possibile est imitari.*"

with a man from the senatorial class received an imperial grant of marriage. Significantly the marriage of Justinian and Theodora c. 524 C.E. brought in its wake the marriage of her sister Comito to Sittas, one of Justinian's most trusted generals, and that of the actress Antonina with the self-made general Belisarius.[76] Theodora herself had an illegitimate daughter who benefited from this law. She came to live in honor in Constantinople and made illustrious matches for her sons.[77] Although Theodora and her daughter, Comito, and Antonia profited from Justinian's marriage law it is unlikely that the edict had any appreciable impact on the status of the majority of actresses.[78] There is nothing in the sources to suggest that it became commonplace for actresses to marry into the highest echelons of early Byzantine society.[79] Nor is there evidence that significant numbers of penitent actresses received an imperial grant altering their legal status. Today it would be imprudent to argue as did Alexander Vasiliev in 1950 that the implications of C.J. 5.4.23 were so great that it could be interpreted as "merely one step in the process of the emancipation of women which goes back to the fourth and fifth centuries and was in accordance with Christian sentiment."[80] The law applied to a narrowly defined group of women, former actresses and their daughters, who met specific conditions and had applied for an imperial grant to contract a legal marriage.

Only those women of the stage who "having deserted their evil and disgraceful condition, (they) embrace a more proper life, and conduct themselves honorably" were eligible to apply for the imperial grant. Working actresses and their daughters, married actresses, freedwomen and their daughters, daughters of tavernkeepers, and prostitutes continued to suffer all of the legal infamy and marriage disabilities they had endured since the first century.[81]

The question that must be raised is why, aside from the obvious personal concern that Justinian had in preparing the way for his marriage

---

[76] Averil Cameron, *Procopius*, 81.

[77] Averil Cameron, *Procopius*, 81.

[78] Daube, "Marriage," 392.

[79] Browning, *Justinian*, 41.

[80] Vasiliev, 92.

[81] C.J. 5.4.23.7 "We, under all circumstances, annul criminal and incestuous unions, as well as those which were especially prohibited by the provisions of former laws; with the exception, however, of such as We authorize by the present decree . . ." (*Nam nefarios et incestos coitus omnibus modis amputamus, sicut et illos, qui praeteritarum legum sanctione specialiter vetiti sunt, exceptis videlicet his, quos praesenti lege permisimus legitimique matrimonii iure muniri praecepimus.*)

with Theodora, the rescript only applies to former actresses and their daughters. One reason might be the lingering disjunction between an actress's legal infamy and her public adoration. By performing in the public sphere women of the stage had a greater potential to gain access to men of higher social status that was denied to other infamous women. Their beauty, talent, and sexual allure may have been particularly attractive to self-made men like Sittas and Bellasarius, who recently had made their way into the senatorial class and were less likely to have class prejudices against women of the stage. What C.J. 5.4.23 did was to make it possible for a select number of former actresses and their daughters to breach the centuries long marital boundaries protecting the senatorial class. These women had to meet very specific requirements that removed the fears that women of the stage would not be chaste wives. In this respect Justinian's sixth century marriage law resonates with C.Th. 15.7.4, 8 and 9 of the late fourth century. The primary source of male anxiety about women of the stage in the sixth century, as it was in the fourth, was the fear that they would not embody the societal ideal of a chaste matron once they had received an imperial concession.

The wording of C.J. 5.4.23 continues to put forward the social construct of actresses as morally depraved individuals who consciously chose an infamous occupation because of the "weakness of their sex" (*imbecillitate sexus*). The innuendo of sexual promiscuity permeates the texts. The rescript stipulates that only women who had already demonstrated that they had replaced their "dishonorable conduct," "disgraceful choice of life," and "dishonorable acts" with "a display of proper moderation" and obtained a "better repute" could have their infamous status replaced with that of a free born person and therefore contract an honorable marriage.[82] The new status meant that the women no longer had a disreputable past. They were not reformed actresses or even former actresses but legally they were new creatures.

Nevertheless, Procopius's *Secret History* demonstrates how difficult it was for some members of early Byzantine society to forgive and forget an actress's infamous past. His invective against the Empress focuses almost exclusively on what he alleges to be her sexual misconduct. According to Procopius Theodora was not the reformed woman eligible for marriage with a senator as proscribed in C.J. 5.4.23. He concocted stories, embellished with lurid and explicit detail to lend credibility to his allegations, of

[82] C.J. 5.4.23.1

Theodora's insatiable sexual appetite before and after her marriage to Justinian. Although it is unlikely that Procopius was telling the truth about the Empress's behavior he chose to attack her in the one area of her life where she and other Byzantine women were the most vulnerable—their reputation. While it may be true as Averil Cameron asserts that once Theodora became empress her past became irrelevant for men such as John of Ephesus and others whose causes she supported, for others it remained an issue.[83] The cultural prejudice against actresses meant that Procopius thought his readers might be willing to believe, or at least accept the possibility, that there was some truth to the most outrageous and titillating yarns he spun about Theodora's sexual conduct.[84] He knew there was always the lingering aura of licentiousness and wantonness surrounding women who had had any connection with the stage and he revelled in exploiting that prejudice.

This conclusion is supported by the example of the two holy fools in John of Ephesus's *Lives of Eastern Saints* written in the late sixth century. According to John, a man and a woman living in spiritual marriage stayed for a time in Amida, "a city of Christians," masquerading by day as mimical performers—hence as harlot and pimp. By adopting the disguise of actor and actress the couple daily suffered abuse and humiliation. Their secret holy life was uncovered by a monk who was intrigued by the fact that men who wished to buy the woman's favors could not find the couple after dark. The monk covertly followed the couple one night and discovered that they were not what they had pretended to be. He observed them praying in a remote spot on the city walls, the air around them shining in radiance. After they had been confronted by the monk and confessed to the form of asceticism they had been practising, the couple quickly left Amida. If their secret had become known they would no longer have been the object of abuse by the citizens of Amida, an essential part of their asceticism.[85] The story emphasizes that the social construct of theatrical performers as sexually degenerate was a continuing source of social stigma

---

[83] C.J. 5.4.23 "*lapsus quoque mulierum, per quos indignam honore conversationem imbecilitate sexus elegerint, cum competenti moderatione sublevandos esse censemus minimeque eis spem melioris condicionis adimere, ut ad eam respicientes improvidam et minus honestam electionem facilius derelinquant.*"

[84] Cameron, *Procopius*, 77-78. A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602* (2 vols.; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1964), 1.270 believes that the aristocracy bitterly hated her.

[85] Procopius, *Secret History* 9.10-26.

and anxiety. It further suggests that theatrical performers, at least those of the most common sort, may have suffered more social abuse in a largely Christian society than they had prior to the fifth century.

In conclusion, while some segments of society were perfectly willing to overlook the social and legal stigma suffered by women of the stage and their daughters, early Byzantine society as a whole inherited and maintained both the social construct of actresses as sexually depraved women and also the Roman legal concept of permanent degradation for some individuals and professions. For all but a handful of fortunate women, the legal infamy and social barriers prohibiting actresses and their daughters from contracting legal marriages continued into early Byzantine society. Actresses and their daughters were given the opportunity to convert and redeem their souls but only on the condition that they sever all connection with the stage. Even then the social stigma of a former actress's infamy continued to be a barrier to her husband's ability to advance to the office of bishop. Only those actresses who completely disguised their female identity and adopted the life of a male ascetic were able to overcome the social and legal infamy and become models of the faith.[86]

Santa Clara University, Dept. of History
Santa Clara, CA 95053

[86] Harvey, *Asceticism & Society*, 92. See also John of Ephesus, *Lives* 52 PO 19:164-79.

CONCORDANCE DES APOPHTEGMATA PATRUM

PAR

YOUHANNA NESSIM YOUSSEF

Au cours de ces dernières années, plusieurs recherches ont été faites pour la publication des Apophtegmes des Pères.[1]

La version copte nous est parvenue par un seul manuscrit dont il ne reste que près du tiers. Ce manuscrit qui a été éparpillée dans les Bibliothèques de Naples, de Paris, Londes et Vienne, naguère a été rassemblée par le Regretté M. Chaîne.[2] La publication des nouvelles pièces du Musée de Pushkin a permis de combler quelques lacunes.[3]

La collection systématique (grecque) a été traduite et publiée en français par le Regretté, le R.P. J.C. Guy[4] qui a déclaré "Bien qu'elle (la version Copte) soit aussi un témoin indirect de cet état *a*, nous n'avons pas utilisé pour l'établissement du texte la traduction copte dont M. Chaîne a publié les fragments conservés."[5]

Nous avons jugé utile de soumettre au monde savant une concordance entre les deux versions qui sera utile pour une comparaison sémantique et linguistique.[6]

---

[1] J.C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum, Subsidia Hagiographica* 36, (Bruxelles [2]1984) avec des compléments 249-275. Cette concordance est un mis à jour de celle qui est donné p. 262.

[2] M. Chaîne, *Le Manuscrit de la Version Copte en Dialecte Sahidique des "Apophthegmata Patrum", Bibliothèque d'Etudes Coptes* 6 (Le Caire 1960) VII-X. J. Hartley, *Studies in the Sahidic version of the Apophthegmata Patrum*, Ann Arbor, Michigan 1969, 269 p.

[3] A. Elanskaya, *The Literary Coptic Manuscripts in the A.S. Pushin State Fine Arts Museum in Moscow. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. XVIII, (Leiden 1994) 11-40.

[4] Cf. J.C. Guy, *Les Apophtegmes des Pères, Collection Systèmatique, Sources Chrétiennes* 387 (Paris 1993).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

[6] Une comparaison a été faite avant la parution de ces nouvelles publications cf. J.M. Sauget, "La version sahidique des Apophthegmata Patrum et son modèle grec" *OCP* 39, 1973, pp. 445-453.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Nous avons choisi d'utiliser l'édition grecque systématique éditée dans la collection *Sources Chrétiennes* N° 387, comme base de comparaison tout en donnant le numéro du texte copte équivalant selon l'édition de Chaîne ou la page de texte et de la traduction de l'autre édition.

Les apophtegmes des Pères (Grec)	Les apophtegmes des Pères (Copte)
Chapitre I	Lacune
Chapitre II	Lacune
Chapitre III, La componction	
N° 19 p. 158-159	N° 226 p. 66 (Texte) p. 139 (Trad.)
N° 38 p. 170-171	N° 1 p. 1 (Texte) p. 85 (Trad.)
N° 39 p. 172-173	N° 2 p. 1 (Texte) p. 85 (Trad.)
N° 40 p. 172-173	N° 3 p. 2 (Texte) p. 86 (Trad.)
N° 41 p. 174-175	N° 7 p. 2 (Texte) p. 86 (Trad.)
Chapitre IV, La maîtrise de soi	
N° 53 p. 212-213	N° 8 p. 2 (Texte) p. 86 (Trad.)
N° 54 p. 212-213	N° 9 p. 3 (Texte) p. 86 (Trad.)
N° 55 p. 212-213	N° 10 p. 3 (Texte) p. 86 (Trad.)
N° 56 p. 214-215	N° 11 p. 3 (Texte) p. 86 (Trad.)
N° 57 p. 214-215	N° 12 p. 3 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 58 p. 214-215	N° 13 p. 3 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 59 p. 214-215	N° 14 p. 3 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 60 p. 214-215	N° 15 p. 3 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 63 p. 216-217	N° 16 p. 3 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 64 p. 216-217	N° 17 p. 3 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 65 p. 216-217	N° 18 p. 4 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 66 p. 216-217	N° 19 p. 4 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 67 p. 218-219	N° 20 p. 4 (Texte) p. 87 (Trad.)
N° 69 p. 218-219	N° 21 p. 4 (Texte) p. 88 (Trad.)
Chapitre V, Divers récits pour le réconfort dans les combats qui suscite en nous la fornication	
N° 6 p. 318-319	p. 13 (Texte) 26 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 7 p. 318-319	p. 13 (Texte) 26 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 8 p. 318-319	p. 13 (Texte) 26 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 9 p. 322-323	N° 22 p. 4 (Texte) p. 88 (Trad.)
N° 10 p. 322-323	N° 23 p. 4 (Texte) p. 88 (Trad.)
N° 11 p. 322-323	N° 25 p. 5 (Texte) p. 88 (Trad.)
N° 14 p. 324-325	N° 26 p. 5 (Texte) p. 88 (Trad.)
N° 15 p. 324-325	N° 27 p. 5 (Texte) p. 88 (Trad.)

N° 16 p. 324-325	N° 28 p. 5 (Texte) p. 89 (Trad.)
N° 17 p. 324-325	N° 29 p. 5 (Texte) p. 89 (Trad.)
N° 18 p. 326-327	N° 30 p. 6 (Texte) p. 89 (Trad.)
N° 19 p. 326-327	N° 31 p. 6 (Texte) p. 89 (Trad.)
N° 20 p. 326-327	p. 15 (Texte) 27 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 21 p. 328-329	p. 15 (Texte) 28 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 22 p. 328-329	p. 15 (Texte) 28 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 23 p. 328-329	p. 16 (Texte) 28 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 24 p. 330-331	p. 16 (Texte) 28 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 25 p. 330-331	p. 17 (Texte) 29 (Trad.) Elanskaya
Chapitre VII, Divers récits nous préparent à l'endurance et au courage	
N° 4 p. 338-339	N° 33 p. 6 (Texte) p. 89 (Trad.)
N° 5 p. 338-339	N° 32 p. 6 (Texte) p. 89 (Trad.)
N° 9 p. 340-341	N° 34 p. 6 (Texte) p. 90 (Trad.)
N° 10 p. 340-341	N° 35 p. 7 (Texte) p. 90 (Trad.)
N° 11 p. 342-343	N° 36 p. 7 (Texte) p. 90 (Trad.)
N° 12 p. 342-343	N° 37 p. 7 (Texte) p. 90 (Trad.)
N° 14 p. 344-345	N° 38 p. 7 (Texte) p. 90 (Trad.)
N° 15 p. 346-347	N° 39 p. 8 et la suite, p. 17 (Texte) 29 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 16 p. 346-347	p. 18 (Texte) 29 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 17 p. 346-347	p. 18 (Texte) 29 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 18 p. 350-351	p. 19 (Texte) 31 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 20 p. 350-351	p. 19 (Texte) 31 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 24 p. 354-355	N° 40 p. 8 (Texte) p. 91 (Trad.)
N° 25 p. 356-357	N° 41 p. 8 (Texte) p. 91 (Trad.)
N° 26 p. 356-357	N° 42 p. 9 (Texte) p. 92 (Trad.)
N° 27 p. 356-357	N° 43 p. 9 (Texte) p. 92 (Trad.)
N° 28 p. 358-359	N° 44 p. 9 (Texte) p. 92 (Trad.)
N° 29 p. 358-359	N° 45 p. 9 (Texte) p. 92 (Trad.)
N° 38 p. 372-373	N° 46 p. 10 (Texte) p. 92 (Trad.)
N° 39 p. 372-373	N° 47 p. 10 (Texte) p. 93 (Trad.)
N° 40 p. 372-373	N° 48 p. 10 (Texte) p. 93 (Trad.)
N° 41 p. 374-375	N° 49 p. 10 (Texte) p. 93 (Trad.)
N° 42 p. 374-375	N° 50 p. 11 (Texte) p. 93 (Trad.)
N° 43 p. 376-377	N° 51 p. 11 (Texte) p. 94 (Trad.)
Chapitre VIII, Qu'il ne faut rien faire par ostention	
Chapitre IX, Qu'il faut veiller à ne juger personne	
N° 10 p. 432-433	p. 20 (Texte) 31 (Trad.) Elanskaya

N° 11 p. 434-435	p. 20 (Texte) 32 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 13 p. 436-437	p. 21 (Texte) 32 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 14 p. 438-439	p. 21 (Texte) 32 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 15 p. 438-439	p. 22 (Texte) 32 (Trad.) Elanskaya
N° 16 p. 438-439	p. 22 (Texte) 32 (Trad.) Elanskaya

8/85 Surrey Road, *Blackburn* Vic 3130 Australia

REVIEWS

Ellen Birnbaum, *The place of Judaism in Philo's thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes.* Brown Judaic Studies 290, Studia Philonica Monographs 2, Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press 1996. xviii, 262 pages.

Philo of Alexandria is, albeit less often, also called Philo the Jew, and this study of Ellen Birnbaum, a revised version of her doctoral dissertation (Columbia University, 1992), deals especially with the Jewish aspect of Philo's thought. The question Birnbaum poses is how Philo himself assesses the significance of being a Jew. Two related issues that Birnbaum brings up are (1) the philosophical quest to "see God," and (2) the covenant between God and biblical Israel. Birnbaum places these issues in the larger framework of the tension between particularism and universalism. Does Philo believe that anyone can participate in the relationship with God (the universalist position), or can only Jews do this (the particularist view)? In order to investigate these questions Birnbaum examines Philo's use of the term "Israel." This examination is especially suited to the question that she raises, because Israel, in Philo's view, means "one that sees God," and seeing God may be regarded as universal. Yet at the same time, "Israel" is the name used in the Bible for the Jewish people.

In Chapter I Birnbaum reports her interesting observations on Philo's use of the terms "Israel" and "the Jews." To describe the actual nation Philo uses "Jews" or "Hebrews," not "Israel." He mentions "Jews" by name in the Exposition only; in the Allegory by way of contrast he frequently speaks about "Israel." Only in the Exposition does he speak at length about the biblical nation and his Jewish contemporaries. The difference in use of the terms between the series of the Philonic writings coheres with the different purposes of the series.

Chapter II treats some aspects of "Israel" and the vision of God. Birnbaum pays attention to the background of Philo's etymology for "Israel" as "one that sees God." She also discusses Philo's thought on seeing God, and she remarks that Philo's ideas show inconsistencies. Instead of ironing out contradictions, she suggests some factors that may influence Philo's presentation. Among other things, she names the relationship between his ideas and the biblical text he is interpreting. In the next chapter Birnbaum

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

addresses the question whether "the ones that can see" can be identified with a real social group. An examination of the relevant passages leads to the conclusion that it is impossible to do so. "Israel," the class that can see, consists of all respected philosophers, whether they are Jews or not.

Chapter IV deals with Philo's presentation of the relationship between God and biblical Israel. In the Bible this relationship is based on the covenant that God established with his people, and is founded in the promises that He made to the patriarchs. Analysing a number of relevant passages from the different series, Birnbaum shows that Philo transforms the biblical presentation. He hardly speaks about God's covenant; instead he presents the view that God associates with virtue and with wise and knowing people.

In answering the question how Philo interprets the relationship between God and the contemporary Jews, Birnbaum gives five features, prime among which is that the Jews believe in the one true God. Careful analysis of Philonic passages shows that he transforms the biblical verses about God and the Jews. The Jewish exegete presents the relationship as "accessible to any virtuous person who turns to belief in the truly Existent" (p. 164). In the final chapter Birnbaum discusses the relationship of proselytes with God, the Jews and Israel. She concludes that Philo associates proselytes with the Jews, not with Israel. Israel remains exclusive and is reserved for those who are spiritually qualified to see God. At the end of the study Birnbaum draws the conclusion that Philo is not a particularist, because he thinks that non-Jews are also able to see God; neither is he a universalist, because he excludes from Israel, the class that can see, those who do not believe in the one God. With regard to the central theme of the study, the place of Judaism in Philo's thought, Birnbaum remarks that "Judaism represents one approach—indeed probably the best approach—to belief in the one God" (p. 229). His commitment to being a Jew should thus be explained as resulting from his involvement with the Jewish community.

Birnbaum's monograph is a thorough study of an important aspect of Philo's thought, with ample attention to methodological questions. She sets clearly out her method and her assumptions regarding studying Philo. One assumption is, very rightly, that Philo is first and foremost an exegete of scripture, and that passages from his writings should be read within their exegetical context. Birnbaum takes also into account that Philo wrote different series of writings with different purposes and directed toward different audiences. Regarding the theme of the study she discusses other

approaches by other scholars as well. These are all factors that make the study an example of sound scholarship.

A related issue deserves, I think, further investigation, namely the connection between seeing God and happiness. At *QE* 2.51 Philo states: "For the beginning and the end of happiness is to be able to see God" (tr. Marcus). In several places in the Exposition Philo speaks about happiness; for instance, at the end of *Spec.* 1 he remarks that knowledge of God is the consummation of happiness. Particularly striking is *Abr.* 58, where he writes that the one to whom it is given to see the Father and Maker of all is advanced to the crowning point of happiness (cf. *Abr.* 268, *Spec.* 2.38, 259, *Virt.* 119). The Exposition, however, is exactly the series in which Philo hardly mentions Israel, he who sees God. It seems to me that this question, the relationship between seeing God and happiness, raises interesting questions which need to be pursued further. Finally I have a rather trivial remark. The chapters of the book are divided in sections and subsections. It would have been convenient, if the titles of all these sections had been listed in a detailed contents, so that the reader could have easily obtained an overview of the division and the subject matter of each chapter. However this may be, I highly recommend Birnbaum's study to every Philonist, and no less to Patristic scholars, for, as is well known, the themes of Israel and seeing God had an important future among the Fathers.[1]

Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Faculteit der Wijsbegeerte A.C. GELJON

Die Polykarpbriefe, übersetzt und erklärt von Johannes Bapt. Bauer (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern. Fünfter Band.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995. 112 p.

Until a few years ago there was a serious need for up-to-date commentaries on the Apostolic Fathers. The writings commonly given this title had received a quite stepmotherly treatment, at least in comparison with other early Christian pseudo- or post-apostolic writings. Now, however, the *Ergänzungsreihe* to the famous *Kritisch-exegetischen Kommentar über das Neue Testament* provides us among others with fine commentaries. After the volumes on

[1] Written with the financial support of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

the *Didachè* (K. Niederwimmer, 1993) and the *Shepherd of Hermas* (N. Brox. 1991), Bauer's treatment of the *Letter(s) of Polycarp* has been made available. According to the style of the series one finds before the "*Übersetzung und Kommentar*" a thorough introduction in which due attention is given to the Latin translation of the Letter (pp. 15-18). In the light of the difficult accessibility of this translation, it has usefully been printed as an appendix to the commentary (pp. 87-93). This is not superfluous, when one recognizes how defective the transmission of the Greek text is (about this problem Bauer might have also referred to the contribution of F.R. Prostmeier in *Vig.Christ.* 48, 1994).

Bauer's commentary maintains the high quality of the series, both in its collection and discussion of the relevant material from the *Umwelt* and in its evaluation of the position of the Letter in the whole of early Christian literature. One could of course pose critical questions about minor elements such as the date of Polycarp's death (assumed to be in the year 167, cf. p. 12). On the other hand particular difficulties are treated with great skill, such as the *Vexierzitate* (cf. pp. 66 ff. and the note on Polycarp, *Phil.* 11,3 recently published by M.W. Holmes in *Vig.Christ.* 51, 1997).

Nevertheless there does remain in our view a major difficulty in Bauer's approach. From the very beginning (*Vorwort*) he accepts the *Teilungshypothese* of Harrison without much discussion (cf. pp. 18-19; 62). It seems as if he leaves it to other recent studies such as Pilhofer's (*Philippi: Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas*, 1995) to argue this problem in detail. Moreover, as to the precarious question about the relation of the Letter to the pauline Pastoral Epistles, Bauer seems to hide himself behind the authority of H. von Campenhausen (*Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe*, 1963) without arriving at a clear position of his own.

These comments will not prevent Bauer's work from serving as an important tool for the study of Polycarp's remarkable Letter.

B-2640 *Mortsel*, Maxlaan 13 B. DEHANDSCHUTTER

Eric Osborn, *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West.* Cambridge, University Press, 1997. XXI, 285 p.

Whoever has some acquaintance with Tertullian's writings knows how they are full of tension. This tension manifests itself in oppositions, paradoxes and antitheses. It is not easy to discover the patterns of thinking which are located behind or underneath the vigorous statements, many of which often seem to contradict each other.

Eric Osborn has ventured to draw a picture of that pattern of thinking of "the first Theologian of the West," and he has done it in an admirable way. His book contains eleven chapters, in which he sketches the various aspect of Tertullian's theology.

The first chapter, entitled "Simplicity and perfection," deals with Tertullian's quest for simplicity, which is given expression in his frequent "massive" statements on the one hand and the intricacy of his apologetic thought on the other.

Chapters two and three deal with what the author calls "the puzzle" and "the paradox." The "puzzle" is the apparent contradiction between the famous rhetorical question "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?," which seems to create an opposition between faith and philosophy, and the fact that Tertullian's writings are full of philosophical arguments.

The "paradox" is the equally famous "*credo quia ineptum est*" (often erroneously cited as "*credo quia absurdum est*"). The author mentions several interpretations, and then gives his own explanation, which seems to me convincing. Tertullian argues: If God, who is totally other, is joined to mortal man, this cannot but happen in a way which is inept to our understanding. Otherwise God would no longer be God. If there is a true incarnation, this *must* be inept. The ineptitude of God becoming man constitutes, therefore, a reason for belief. Most ineptitudes are false, this one is not.

Other chapters deal with "Strife of opposites and faith as recognition," "Antitheses in one God: 'Against Marcion'" (Tertullian had a good reason for fighting against Marcion at such great length; he had to defend the oneness of God.), "Trinity and Christology," "Prayer and the bible," "Mankind's two natures and a sordid church," "Argument and humour: Hermogenes and the Valentinians" (why is Hermogenes met with arguments and is Valentinus ridiculed?), "Promise of laughter, judgement of hell: apocalypse and system," "Ethics of conflict." Finally in his Conclusion the author discusses the weakness and strength of Tertullian's thinking.

In all these chapters the author sticks close to the words of Tertullian

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

himself. Every move of his expositions is substantiated by the quotation of a text or a reference to it. These are almost invariably accurate. Only in one case did I notice a misreading of a text, which is worth mentioning, because it is so "tertullianesque." On page 161 the author writes: "He (Tert.) criticizes Marcion's docetic Christ (Marc.5.20.3): 'Not in reality and the likeness of man, not in a man and found in human shape, not in substance, that is not in flesh'" (In a note: *non veritate, et in similitudine hominis, non in homine et figura inventus homo, non substantia, id est non carne.*) This quotation misses its point of departure, which results in distortion. Marcion argues from Phil. 2,6-7: *[sed (Christus) exhausit semet ipsum]/accepta effigie servi, non veritate,/et in similitudine hominis, non in homine/et figura inventus homo, non substantia, id est non carne.* "He assumed the image of a slave, not in reality, and He was found in the likeness of a man, not in a man, and in a human shape, not in substance, that is not in flesh." Then Tertullian adds: *Quasi non et figura et similitudo et effigies substantiae quoque accedant.* "As if shape and likeness and image go without substance." It is evident that *accepta effigie servi* cannot be missed in this quotation.

The author has in his eloquent way brought Tertullian nearer to the modern reader. This monograph represents an admirable achievement.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Clément d'Alexandrie, *Les Stromates*. Stromate VII. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Alain Le Boulluec (Sources Chrétiennes 428). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997. 351 p. 197 F. ISBN 2-204-05828-9.

"On dit trop souvent que les *Stromates* sont confus," dit l'auteur dans son Introduction (p. 9), et il montre que le livre VII a été bien composé. Il esquisse d'un façon très claire les trois développements de ce livre.

Une traduction des *Stromates* demande beaucoup d'un traducteur. Mais M. Le Boulluec est comme peu d'autres à la hauteur de cette tâche. Il traduit d'une façon très précise et les notes en bas de pages expliquent bien les endroits où le lecteur peut avoir des difficultés. Il se montre véritablement un maître dans ce domaine, parsemé de pièges. Je n'hésite pas à dire que cette édition est un chef-d'oeuvre.

Cela n'empêche pas que parfois on peut avoir une autre idée d'un passage particulier. Je voudrais discuter avec l'auteur sur l'interprétation de deux passages.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Dans § 42, 2-4, dans une discussion sur la prière, Clément fait une remarque intéressante sur la relation entre la providence divine et la piété du gnostique. Il dit d'abord qu'il y a une συμπλοκή, c'est-à dire un entrelacement entre les deux (συμπλακεῖσα τῇ μακαρίᾳ προνοίᾳ ἡ τοῦ γνωστικοῦ ὁσιότης), et il l'explique comme suit: Οἱονεὶ γὰρ ἀντεπιστροφή τίς ἐστι τῆς προνοίας ἡ τοῦ γνωστικοῦ ὁσιότης καὶ ἀντίστροφος εὔνοια τοῦ φίλου τοῦ θεοῦ. L'auteur traduit: "Car la piété du gnostique est un retour à elle-même de la pensée providentielle et une réponse de la pensée affectueuse de l'ami de Dieu." La piété du gnostique est donc, selon l'auteur, un retour *à elle même* de la pensée providentielle. Peut-être l'auteur a-t-il en vue l'ἐπιστροφή plotinienne. Mais le terme ἀντεπιστροφή signifie "un mouvement correspondant" (Lampe: "corresponding movement"). L'idée de correspondance est dans le préfix ἀντί. La piété du gnostique est un mouvement correspondant à celui de la providence. Cette interprétation est confirmée par le subséquent ἀντίστροφος εὔνοια, qui a été traduit per "une réponse de la pensée affectueuse." Evidemment c'est une réponse à la pensée providentielle. Cette réponse est le mouvement correspondant à celui de la providence. Ces deux mouvements s'entrelacent.

Mais d'ou vient la correspondance entre ces deux mouvements? Clément le dit ainsi: Οὔτε γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἄκων ἀγαθός . . . οὔτε μὴν ἄκων σωθήσεται ὁ σῳζόμενος. L'auteur traduit: "Or, si Dieu n'est pas bon involontairement . . ., le sauvé ne sera pas non plus sauvé involontairement." Je préférerais traduire γάρ par "car"; autrement il n'est pas évident qu'on a affaire ici à une explication. La correspondance est dans le caractère volontaire des deux activités (voyez aussi le ἑκούσιον dans 42,2 et ἑκουσίως dans 42,4).

Dans § 55 Clément écrit, comment on va de la foi à la connaissance, la "gnose." La foi, dit-il, est un bien qui est une disposition intérieure, sans qu'on fasse de Dieu un objet de recherche (ἄνευ τοῦ ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν). Cette recherche donne la "gnose."

Alors il parle de la relation entre γνῶσις et σοφία: "Il y a une différence entre la connaissance et la sagesse inculquée par l'enseignement" (Γνῶσιν δὲ σοφίας κατὰ διδασκαλίαν ἐγγινομένης διαφέρειν φαμέν). Et il l'explique ainsi: "Là où il y a de la connaissance, il se trouve aussi forcément que c'est de la sagesse, mais où il y a de la sagesse, il n'y a forcément connaissance." Or le terme "sagesse" a une application plus large que le terme "connaissance." Pourquoi? Clément le dit ainsi: Ἐν μόνῃ γὰρ τῇ τοῦ προφορικοῦ λόγου * τὸ τῆς σοφίας ὄνομα φαντάζεται. Ainsi le texte dans l'édition de Stählin. On attend un substantif avec τῇ, mais Stählin ne fait pas de choix entre les conjectures diverses, qui ont été faites et qu'il mentionne

dans l'apparat critique (χρήσει, χώρᾳ, διδαχῇ, παραδόσει, ἐνεργείᾳ), mais il pose un astérix. L'auteur présent suit le propos de Tengblad et écrit σοφίᾳ, et il traduit; "Car le nom de sagesse n'a d'application visible que dans la sagesse de la parole extérieure."

On se demande qu'est ce que c'est "une application visible de la sagesse." Et quel est le rôle de cette constatation dans l'argumentation de Clément?

Clément doit donner ici une explication du fait, qu'il y a une "sagesse" qui n'est pas nécessairement "connaissance." A mon avis, il dit: "Car le nom de sagesse apparaît (aussi) dans le cas où il y a seulement une . . . de la parole extérieure." Le substantif qui manque doit avoir la signification d'"appréhension" (καταλήψει?). Et cette appréhension correspond, à mon avis, á "la sagesse inculquée par l'enseignement" de dessus, dont il est dit, qu'elle est différente de la "gnose."

Que l'auteur veuille accepter ces remarques comme un signe d'appréciation de son édition excellente.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

E.P. Meijering *Athanasius: Die dritte Rede gegen die Arianer.* Teil II: Kapitel 26-58. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Teil III: Kapitel 59-67 Übersetzung, Kommentar. Theologiegeschichtlicher Ausblick. Amsterdam, Gieben, 1997 und 1998. ISBN 90 5063 367 6 und 90 5063 488 5. 318 u. 282 S.

Im Jahre 1996 erschien der erste Teil dieser der dritten Rede des Athanasius gewidmeten Studie (Vgl. *Vig.Chr.* 51, 1997, 95-96). Jetzt liegen schon die zwei übrigen Teile dieser grossen Arbeit vor. Der Verf. setzt darin seine gründliche Kommentierung das Athanasiustextes fort. Satz für Satz wird erklärt und das im Rahmen der übrigen Werke des Athanasius. Der Verf. zeigt so überzeugend, dass kein Anlass besteht, an der Echtheit dieser Rede zu zweifeln.

Der Verf. hat seinem Kommentar einen theologiegeschichtlichen Ausblick hinzugefügt, in dem er zeigt, wie die Problematik der Beziehung zwischen Wesen und Wille Gottes eine wichtige Rolle in der Geschichte der Theologie gespielt hat. Die These der Arianer war, dass der Sohn durch den Willen des Vaters geworden sei, und mithin ein Geschöpf wäre. Athanasius verteidigt die Lehre, dass die Schöpfung auf den Willen Gottes, die Erzeugung des Sohnes hingegen auf das Wesen Gottes zurückgeführt werden muss. In seinem Ausblick zeigt der Verf. wie diese Problematik, in unterschiedlicher Form, ein fortwährendes Anliegen vieler Theologen gewesen ist.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Er behandelt nach einander Augustin, Anselm von Canterbury, Thomas von Aquin, Gregor von Rimini, Calvin, Turrettini, Schleiermacher, Barth und Pannenberg. Über verschiedene dieser Theologen hat der Verf. eine Monographie geschrieben (Calvin, Turrettini, Barth). Seit seiner Doktorarbeit hat er stets das Denken der Kirchenväter in ihrer Beziehung zu den späteren Theologen gesehen. Seine Einsicht in die Geschichte des theologischen Denkens ist bewundernswert.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Therese Fuhrer, *Augustin, Contra Academicos (vel De Academicis)*, Bücher 2 und 3, Einleitung und Kommentar. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1997 (Patristische Texte und Studien 46).

Die Frühschrift des Augustinus mit dem Titel *Contra Academicos* (oder *De Academicis*) ist in vielfacher Hinsicht ein wichtiges Zeugnis der abendländischen Geistesgeschichte. Denn sie gibt uns Einblick in die geistige Entwicklung eines Mannes, der wie kein zweiter antiker Denker die christliche Theologie des Abendlandes befruchtet hat, indem sie uns die intellektuellen Strömungen, welchen ein junger Mensch im 4.Jh.n.Chr. ausgesetzt war, lebendig vor Augen fuhrt. Eine dieser großen Strömungen ist der Neuplatonismus, dessen Lehren Augustinus zur Zeit der Abfassung dieser Schrift wie ein ausgetrockneter Schwamm in sich aufsaugt, eine zweite—bisher immer zu wenig beachtete—der Skeptizismus. Wie lebendig und mächtig dieser Skeptizismus auch in der Spätantike immer noch ist, das zeigt für das 4.Jh.n.Chr. die Schrift *Contra Academicos* geradezu lebensnah, das zeigen aber auch die späteren Neuplatoniker, die sich bei ihrer Platoninterpretation immer wieder bemüßigt fühlen zu betonen, daß weder Platon, einer der angeblichen Urheber des Skeptizismus, noch die Akademiker ἐφεκτικοί waren (vgl. beispielsweise Anon. Proleg. in Plat. philos. 7,13ff.; 10,5ff. Westerink-Trouillard-Segonds). Darüber hinaus erfahren wir zwar relativ wenig über das aufstrebende Christentum, aber sehr viel über das Leben, Denken und Fühlen der Menschen dieser Zeit, über ihre Bildung und Ausbildung sowie über ihre materielle und geistige Kultur.

Diese in so vieler Hinsicht reiche, oft aber auch äußerst schwierige Schrift wird durch den vorliegenden Kommentar von Therese Fuhrer in vorbildlicher Weise erschlossen. In einer gedrängten, aber alles Wesentliche besprechenden Einleitung (S.1-54) gibt die Verfasserin Auskunft über die Stellung

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

von *Contra Academicos* im Gesamtwerk des Augustinus, die Entstehung und Datierung der Schrift, den Adressaten Romanianus, die Gesprächsteilnehmer Augustinus, Licentius, Alypius und Trygetius, den Ort und die Szenerie, die Frage nach der Historizität, die Dialogform und die Struktur des Werkes, den Titel, die Thematik und die Intention der Schrift, Augustinus' Verhältnis zum Skeptizismus der Neuen Akademie sowie zum Platonismus und zur christlichen Lehre, über die Quellen, Sprache und Stil, die Argumentationsform, die Textüberlieferung und die Nachwirkung der Schrift. Es folgt der Kommentar (S.55-482), der—in 14 Sinnabschnitte gegliedert—zunächst jeden dieser Abschnitte in seiner Gesamtheit vorstellt und bespricht und dann in einer fortlaufenden Erklärung Zeile für Zeile so ausführlich und eindringlich interpretiert, daß jeder Benutzer seine helle Freude daran haben wird, mag er nun mit mehr philologischen, philosophischen oder theologischen Interessen an die Schrift herantreten. Beschlossen wird das Werk durch zwei Anhänge von Corrigenda bzw. Abweichungen vom Text der benutzen Ausgabe Greens (CCL XXIX 2,2—S.483-486), ein umfangreiches und übersichtlich geordnetes Literaturverzeichnis (S.487-501) und ein detailliertes Stellenverzeichnis (S.503-532). Ohne Übertreibung darf man sagen, daß dieser Kommentar eine meisterhafte Leistung ist. Dieses Urteil hat auch dann Bestand, wenn man im Einzelfall anderer Meinung ist; denn immer ist die Entscheidung der Verfasserin wohldurchdacht und gut begründet.

Gleichwohl scheint mir ihre Entscheidung beispielsweise an folgenden Stellen nicht richtig zu sein (Ich wähle einige Fälle aus dem Proömium zum zweiten Teil des Werkes, den Büchern 2-3, aus):

1. Textkritisch problematisch scheint mir die Konjektur der Verfasserin 2,2,5,60 (S.97f.) zu sein: *tandem* statt *tamen* (codd. HPRST; Knöll, Green, Gent.) bzw. *tantum* (cod. M; Maur. Joliv. Cap). Denn *tamen* bezeichnet hier den Gegensatz zu *cursim* und wird m.E. gestützt durch *confiteor* und *de itinere*. Der Passus ist also, wie folgt, zu übersetzen: "Sofort kehrte ich in großer Eile (*cursim*) ganz in mich selbst zurück. Dennoch, so muß ich gestehen (*tamen, confiteor*), warf ich gleichsam noch vom eingeschlagenen Weg aus (*de itinere*) einen Blick auf jene alte Religion zurück." Die innere Bewegung, die Augustinus hier beschreibt, ist analog zu der, die er wenige Zeilen später als *properans haesitans* charakterisiert. Gestützt wird diese Interpretation durch den Gesamtzusammenhang: Die Lektüre der platonischen *libri quidam pleni* führt zu einer völligen Abkehr von all dem, was bisher das Leben des Augustinus bestimmt hat—*honor* und *fama* vermögen ihn nun nicht mehr zu locken—und er kehrt fast überstürzt (*cursim*) ganz zu sich selbst zurück.

Dennoch (*tamen*) vermag er einen Bestandteil seines früheren Lebens—*illam religionem, quae pueris nobis insita est et medullitus inplicata*—nicht aufzugeben. Noch auf seinem Weg zu sich selbst blickt er auf diesen zurück, und zwar deswegen, weil die *religio* ihn mit Macht an sich zieht, ohne daß ihm dies wirklich bewußt ist (*ipsa ad se nescientem rapiebat*). Sie allein hat also ihre Anziehungskraft auch angesichts der Macht des Neuplatonismus nicht verloren.

2. Interpretatorisch scheint mir an der Auslegung des ersten Satzes des zweiten Buches die Anmerkung zu 2,1,5f. (S.58) nicht richtig zu sein, daß der Skeptizismus nach dem Sieg über die Stoa "eigentlich überflüssig geworden" sei. Das heißt das Pferd von hinten—nämlich von 3,17,37-3,19,42—aufzäumen. Denn der erste Satz sagt nur: Wenn mit dem Suchen der Wahrheit *notwendigerweise* auch das Finden derselben verbunden wäre, dann wäre aller Skeptizismus längst mit dem Tode des Karneades und Cicero erledigt. Das heißt, den Skeptizismus wird es immer geben, weil das Finden der Wahrheit so schwierig ist.

3. In 2,1,2,43f. ist es gewiß nicht die *temperantia*, die "den Körper wieder verlässt" (S.71)—wie sollte sie den *Körper* verlassen? Nein, die *virtus*, von der das gesagt wird, ist identisch mit der vorher genannten *naturalis mentis altitudo*, also der *mens perfecta* im stoischen und Ciceronischen Sinne. Diese *mens perfecta* ist es, die den Körper verläßt. Seltsam ist, daß diese *mens* den Körper "wieder" (*rursus*) verläßt. Liegt hier ein Hinweis auf die Seelenwanderung vor?

4. *Ad summum ipsum modum* (2,2,4,31—S.83) ist doch wohl neuplatonisch zu deuten, wenn man auf das *ipsum* achtet. Der entsprechende griechische Ausdruck würde lauten: πρὸς ἔσχατον αὐτὸ τὸ μέτρον (τὸ αὐτόμετρον).

5. Der Ausdruck *admoto nobis fomite* (2,2,5,45—S.89) will m.E. besagen, daß Romanianus vor seinem Weggang in Augustinus (*nobis*) den Zunder/Zündstoff gelegt hat, aus dem zunächst eine Flamme, dann ein großer Brand entsteht.

6. Gelegentlich wird man den Text anders übersetzen wollen. So würde man *te quaero* (2,1,2,31) nicht gerne übersetzen mit "ich verspüre Verlangen nach dir" (S.68), sondern "ich suche deine Gemeinschaft." A *quo . . . exercearis* (2,2,6,70f.) kann nicht bedeuten "durch den du . . . gebildet . . . wirst" (S.108), sondern "durch den . . . du trainiert . . . wirst"; denn hier ist nicht "die ethische *Bildung*" gemeint, sondern das ethische *Training*, die ethische *Einübung* (ἄσκησις, γυμνασία).

Was den Aufbau des Gesamtwerkes betrifft, so zerfällt es in zwei Teile, das erste und die beiden folgenden Bücher. Diese Teile gliedern sich wieder

in aufeinander folgende Einzelgespräche, die immer länger werden (S.21). Nimmt man die mehrfachen Hinweise des Augustinus auf die Aufzeichnung der Gespräche durch einen anwesenden *notarius* (S.17) ernst, dann hat Augustinus bei der Ausarbeitung des Werkes das Material der Notizen in eben dem Maße stärker herangezogen, wie die Schüler Fortschritte machten und die Gespräche an geistiger Dichte gewannen.

Es sind nicht die Monographien, sondern die Kommentare, die ein Werk wirklich erschließen. Man kann nur hoffen, daß die Verfasserin sich dazu durchringen kann, auch das erste Buch von *Contra Academicos* und vielleicht weitere Werke des großen christlichen Denkers zu kommentieren. Für den vorliegenden Kommentar jedenfalls sind alle, die an Augustinus und der spätantiken Geistesgeschichte interessiert sind, der Verfasserin zu großem Dank verpflichtet.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität MATTHIAS BALTES
Institut für Altertumskunde
Domplatz 20/22
D-48143 *Münster*

Oeuvres de Saint Augustin 11/2: *La doctrine chrétienne. De doctrina christiana.* Texte critique du CCL, revu et corrigé; introd. et trad. de Madeleine Moreau; annot. et notes complementaires d'Isabelle Bochet et Goulven Madec. Bibliothèque Augustinienne. Paris: Institut d'études Augustiniennes. 1997. 626 pp.

In the hausse of interest in Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* (*ddc*), this new French translation with introduction and elaborate notes in the well-known series will be a welcome arrival on many a desk.

On the whole, this is a successful project, with an over-all reliable research tool as its result. No extreme positions are taken up. Both the introduction and the notes give a balanced view of the *status quaestionis* with reasonable and moderate suggestions. In the introduction, three aspects of *ddc* get singled out (cf. n. 26 p. 144): its esthetical appreciation of the Bible (p. 42), the importance of exegesis, and the pedagogical plan underlying the whole work (pp. 22 ff.; esp. 27). While the didactic aspect of *ddc* is rightly stressed, Marrou's view with its emphasis on the passage about a christian incorporation of pagan disciplines (*ddc* II xix 29 ff.) is modified: the whole work should be seen as a didactic enterprise, witness the title,

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

and the novelty of the work resides in "le projet pédagogique d'ensemble, où le savoir profane prend tout son sens d'être mis au service d'un savoir proprement religieux" (p. 35). From the beginning, the parallelism with *Confessiones* is pointed out: the intellectual development as depicted in *ddc* resembles Augustine's own as we know it from *Conf.* (p. 41; see also notes complementaires 542 ff.).

The Latin text is that of the *CCL*. There are some typos (p. 82 *Diximus ne* should be *diximusne*, p. 88 *valea*, l. *valeat*; p. 96 *coniux* l. *coniunx*; p. 114 add comma between *auferat* and *quid* (the main sentence starts with *quid*) and our modern equivalent of manuscript-devouring rodents, the computer, has hit rather hard on p. 134 where seven lines of Latin have been eaten up at the end of book I.

In general, the translation is faithful and useful, but it cannot be blindly trusted. The translator is extremely reluctant to break up Augustine's long periods, which sometimes leads to rather monstruous sentences (e.g. II vi 7, p. 143; IV ix 23, pp. 353-5). She has chosen not to render the many discussions of particular bits of biblical Latin in French, but to just leave them in Latin—which reduces the usability of the translation for those who don't have Latin. And unfortunately, there are some real mistakes as well, which is again of course practically inevitable in a work of this length. The reviewer, who has just finished a Dutch translation of the same work (with J. den Boeft), is only too aware of that. In the spirit of friendly amendment, here are some of them anyway:

– I vi 6, p. 83 *Immo vero nihil me aliud quam dicere voluisse sentio* is not "En vérité, je n'ai pas voulu dire autre chose, je le sais," but "I realize that my only intention was (just) to speak" (i.e. whether or not what he said was adequate, as no statement about God can be). – I ix 9, p. 89 *Id ipsum enim quod interrogat unde sciam, omnibus . . . praesto est* is not "Car la question même qu'on pose: d'où sait-on? se présente aux regards de tous" but the subject of *praesto est* is "*id ipsum*": someone may be asking how one knows this, but in fact, everyone knows it. – I xxxix 30, p. 115 *in societate dilectionis Dei* is not "dans la relation d'amour avec Dieu": the *societas* is the one between people united by their love of God, cf. *socios* in the last line of the section. – II xx 31, p. 185 *Si iunctim ambulantibus amicis lapis aut canis aut puer medius intervenerit* is not "des amis qui, se promenant côte à côte, viennent à heurter une pierre, un chien, un enfant": in this discussion of superstition the point is that a rock, a dog or a child coming *between* the friends on their walk separates them, and so the friends in their superstition hasten to kick or hit it in order to ward off in a quasi-magical way any damage

to the friendship. The next sentence is worse: *atque illud quod lapidem calcant tamquam diremptorem amicitiae minus molestum est, quam cum innocentem puerum colaphio percutiunt, si pariter ambulantibus intercurrit*, rendered as "et aussi que le fait de buter contre une pierre, c'est en quelque sort tuer l'amitié; mais c'est moins fâcheux que de gifler un enfant innocent qui en courant se jette entre deux promeneurs": kicking the stone is a revenge for its having tried to break up the friendship (by landing up between the friends); the stone is the would-be "killer" of friendship, not the kicking, which is intended to set things straight. – In III xxv 36, pp. 282-3, a comparison of Christ to a lion is discussed, but the crucial words *tamquam leo* are omitted in the translation. – III xxix 41, pp. 290-1 words are discussed that express the exact opposite of their literal meaning. This can either be effected through irony, where the intonation is crucial, or through "antiphrasis," which works in different ways: either it uses a word in its proper meaning, but the word's etymology is *e contrario* (e.g. although the only and proper meaning of *lucus* is "(dark) forest," its etymology is *a non lucendo*, i.e. it got its name from the fact that it is never light there; therefore, there is an opposition between the meaning of the word with its connotation of darkness, and the form of the word with its connotation of light); or a word can be used both in its normal meaning and to denote the opposite. This last concept is expressed as follows: (*aut verba habet sua, . . . sicut . . . lucus*); *aut consuevit aliquid ita dici, quamvis dicatur etiam non e contrario, velut cum quaerimus accipere quod ibi non est, et respondetur nobis: "abundat"*: Madeleine Moreau translates "ou bien elle dit ordinairement 'oui' alors qu'on veut au contraire exprimer un 'non'; de même que lorsque nous cherchons quelque part tel objet qui n'y est pas et que l'on nous répond: 'il y en a à revendre!'" Surely *ita* and *non* do not mean "yes" and "no" here, but *ita* modifies *dici* (if for grammatical reasons only, it clearly cannot be its subject), and *non* modifies *e contrario*. Augustine refers to words which are habitually used *ita*, i.e. *e contrario*, although they can also be used in their regular meaning (*non e contrario*). *E contrario* is the operational technical term here, and should not be rendered by the simple discourse marker "au contraire." – III xxxi 44, pp. 296-7. The first rule of Tyconius is "the Lord and His body": *in qua scientes aliquando capitis et corporis, id est Christi et ecclesiae, unam personam nobis intimari . . . non haesitemus quando a capite ad corpus vel a corpore transitur ad caput et tamen non receditur ab una eademque persona*: the point is that the Bible often speaks of one person, while in fact imparting information about either the Head, Christ, or the body, the Church, or both in rapid succession without indicating the transition. Madeleine Moreau translates:

"Grâce à elle [viz. the first rule, IS] nous savons que quelquefois la tête et le corps, c'est-à-dire le Christ et l'Eglise, nous indiquent une seule personne. . . . Ainsi nous ne sommes pas embarrassés quand de la tête on passe au corps, ou du corps à la tête, sans qu'on s'écarte pour autant d'une seule et même personne." The first half of this sentence crucially reverses the semiotic process: sometimes the text describes one person (consisting of head and body). That one person can stand for head and body, either or both. It is not the case that the head and the body reveal one person to us, as the translation suggests, but the other way around, see also "note complementaire" on p. 568. – IV i 2, p. 321 *exspectationem* is not "impatience," cf. *exspectentur* in the next sentence (it is "expectation"). – IV xix 39, p. 382. A good teacher should anticipate the objections from his audience and explain them away. This is better than having those objections arise when the teacher isn't there to deal with them (e.g. when the listener has returned home), or to have them occur to someone in the audience who doesn't speak up: *ne ibi occurrat, ubi non erit qui respondeat, aut praesenti quidem, sed tacenti occurrat et minus sanatus abscedat.* Madeleine Moreau translates: "de crainte qu'elle [viz. an objection, IS] ne vienne à se présenter là où il n'y aura personne pour y répondre, ou alors qu'il y aurait quelqu'un, mais silencieux [suggesting she takes this to refer to the *teacher*?], et qu'elle [the objection? IS] disparaisse sans qu'on y ait remédié". In the Latin, there is a change of subject: maybe a potential objection will occur to someone in the audience who doesn't speak up, and who will therefore leave without the full spiritual benefit of the teaching, i.e. "not fully healed" (*sanatus* cannot, of course, refer to the objection).

However, in spite of these criticisms the reviewer would like to emphasize again that the translation is generally clear and helpful.

The "notes complementaires" are useful well-organized surveys of material relevant to some of the major problems raised by *ddc*, with good bibliographical references. They discuss the date of composition of the prologue and the adversaries envisaged by it; the relationship between grace and human agency; the hermeneutic circle in *ddc*; the distinction between *frui* and *uti*; the definition of God; the role of Neoplatonist thought in book I; the role of Scripture in the divine dispensation of salvation; the theory of signs in book II; the tension between simplicity and obscure mystic depth in the Bible; the road of spiritual development with its seven stages; the Biblical canon, Septuagint and Itala; allegorical interpretation of the pagan legends and cults; the theory of *usus iustus*; an important note on the manichaean criticism of the Old Testament as the background to book III

(pp. 546 ff.); the conceptual link between christian faith and spiritual liberty; the Bible admitting of more than one interpretation; Augustine's presentation of the *Liber regularum* by Tyconius (most helpful discussion, with quiet assessment of the question whether Augustine's presentation means a perversion of the original: Tyconius discusses some of the internal mechanisms of Biblical stylistics; Augustine uses them as "keys" to extract meaning. The commentators play down the difference); and finally, the ideal of the Christian orator. As is not unusual in commentaries, the density of the notes diminishes quite significantly towards the end of the work, and book IV in particular suffers somewhat—it receives only one longer annotation and that one is mainly paraphrastic in nature. Also, the annotators could have considered adding a note on the history of interpretation in antiquity. But that slight omission is amply compensated for by the other notes, which are efficient and to the point.

Amstelveen INEKE SLUITER

Adele Monaci Castagno, *Il diavolo e i suoi angeli, testi e tradizioni (secoli I-III)* (Biblioteca Patristica 28). Fiesole: Nardini Editore, 1996; pb., 507 pp.; L.58,000; ISBN 88-404-2019-3.

The Italian paperback series "Biblioteca Patristica" includes not merely useful editions of important texts, but also anthologies based on a central theme. For example, there is a collection of pagan reactions to the rising Christian faith (nr. 2), of visions and revelations (nr. 8), and of testimonia on Christians and the Roman army (nr. 9). After two recent volumes dedicated to the Antichrist (nrs. 20-21), we are now offered a collection of early texts on the devil himself, compiled by Adele Monaci Castagno (MC). This is a welcome addition, if only because as a central central character in Christian thought the devil should not be missing in the series.

The anthology presents the earliest Christian texts after the New Testament that speak about the devil and his helpers. Starting with testimonies and remarks by the Apostolic Fathers (such as Ignatius of Antioch and the letter of Barnabas), the volume continues with texts from the Greek Apologists, and, interestingly, Gnostic traditions. Great names like Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Cyprian are given due attention. The last author included in the book is Origen, to whom more than a hundred pages are devoted (almost a quarter of the part devoted to texts). For each author

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

or anonymous writing MC gives the relevant portions of the text with an Italian translation on the opposite page, preceded by a brief introduction and followed by ample explanatory notes. The volume opens with a general introduction of over a hundred pages, sketching the preceding history of the theme in the Scriptures and Pseudepigrapha, as well as summarizing the later developments illustrated in the collection itself. Finally, there are three indexes and 19 pages of bibliography.

The thematic and chronological arrangement of the book enables readers to gain a quick overview of Christian ideas on the subject. Perhaps more importantly, it allows them to see how these ideas gradually developed from small and diverse beginnings into a coherent theological system. As MC shows, in this complex process there is a constant interaction between Christian ideas and the world in which they take shape: the ever changing cultural backgrounds lead to corresponding, varying needs of the church. For example, the notion of a hierarchy of devils, with Satan at the top, is still absent from many of the earliest texts. Moreover Christian thought on the devil, MC argues, should not be considered as the result of discussions by specialists and church officials only, but also bears the mark of more widely spread religious ideas and fears. The editor's points are well illustrated by her inclusion of texts from traditions which later came to be labeled as "apocryphal" or "heterodox." Thus we find the Valentinian school and the Acts of Peter placed next to Justinus and Perpetua.

The present anthology steers a convincing middle course between a theological and a historical approach, providing a convenient and rewarding access to texts on a theme which has proved to be "crucial" for Western thought. MC's introduction may prove somewhat too long for many users, but this is only a minor point of criticism, given the many virtues of the book.

Nijmegen (NL), Katholieke Universiteit VINCENT HUNINK

Sozomène, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Livres III-IV. Texte grec de l'édition de J. Bidez, introduction et annotation par Guy Sabbah, traduction par † André-Jean Festugière, o.p. revue par Bernard Grillet (Sources Chrétiennes no. 418). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996. pp. 394. Price: 275 F.

In the first volume of this work, which appeared in 1983 (SC no. 306), the editors made available again the text of Books I and II of Sozomen's *Church History*, established by Joseph Bidez and published by Günther Christian Hansen in 1960 in the GCS series, which had been out of print for some time. In reviewing this first volume (VC 39 [1985] 201-3) I made the observation that its appearance would be applauded even if it only made Bidez' text available again. Since 1983 the Greek ecclesiastical historians have been particularly well served by the publication both of the updated texts of Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen in the GCS series, and of two monographs on Socrates by Theresa Urbainczyz (*Socrates of Constantinople, Historian of Church and State*, Ann Arbor, 1997) and Martin Wallraff (*Der Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates. Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsdarstellung, Methode und Person*, Göttingen, 1997). The SC team was unable to take advantage of Hansen's text of Sozomen (1995), but one hopes that in the third volume this can be remedied, even if it results in minor changes to Festugière's French translation.

A general introduction to Sozomen's *Church History* had already been provided by Bernard Grillet and Guy Sabbah in the first volume, with due attention paid to the author's life and times, his views of history, his use of Socrates, his methodology, and the intended audience of his work. The second volume contains Guy Sabbah's introduction of some thirty pages, devoted to the contents and structure of Books III and IV and an assessment of Sozomen as a historian of the events narrated there. These two books cover the period from the death of Constantinople in 337 to the council of Constantinople in 360, and are more concerned with the second phase of the Arian crisis than with political events in the reigns of the sons of Constantine. Because in Sozomen's hands this results in a non-linear narrative interrupted by digressions, and also because political and military events appear in a fleeting and incoherent manner, G.S. has given a useful overview of the contents of each Book (pp. 14-20). He points to the church historian's limited ability to synthesise and to grasp the complexity of the Arian crisis, arguing that for a more correct view of the period we must have recourse to other sources, notably Ammianus Marcellinus, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Orosius and Zosimus. On the credit side, he

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

admits that in two respects Books III and IV are of vital importance. The first of these consists of the two long excursuses on the monastic movement (III. 14-16) which are independent of his usual sources, Socrates and Sabinus, and are gleaned from Rufinus, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*. The second is Sozomen's depiction (III. 10-13) of the critical role which the councils of Serdica-Philippopolis (342/3) played in the polarisation of the Arian debate. In more general terms G.S. notes that, while the temporal and conceptual distance between Sozomen and the events in his narrative makes his account often vague and erroneous, ironically it also results in a greater objectivity than we find in Socrates.

All of these are valid observations. We need to ask, however, why and to what extent Sozomen's narrative in Books III-IV is faulty. Here a more detailed description and assessment of his sources and how he used them would have been helpful. For instance, it needs to be stated clearly that, although for these Books Sozomen follows Socrates's narrative structure to the extent of incorporating his predecessor's errors as well, for the reign of Constantius II (337-361) he often supplements Socrates. The passages in Books III-IV, where Socrates is independent of Socrates, listed in Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1993, 207-8, are also worth adducing. Similarly a more extensive treatment of the often unacknowledged use which Sozomen makes of the *Synagogue* of Sabinus of Heracleia would have elucidated some of the difficulty which the church historian faced in sifting his sources and assimilating them to the material which he already had at his disposal. After all, it is precisely this difficulty which represents one of the greatest traps in all historiographical writing, and it is perhaps nowhere more evident than when ecclesiastical historians try to combine secular and ecclesiastical events in the one narrative.

The translation of Books III-IV, made by the late André-Jean Festugière and revised by Bernard Grillet, is annotated by G.S. The notes are full and informative citing parallels in other ancient sources and referring the reader to modern reference works in the case of the large cast of figures involved in the Arian debate. Sometimes, however, the works referred to are dated. Nowhere, for example, are the works of Timothy Barnes cited, although the book that I have already mentioned contains a masterly evaluation of the council of Serdica. On p. 120 the reader would expect to be sent to consult Philip Rousseau's work on Pachomius (*Pachomius. The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1985), rather than to a book published in 1900. Modern authors who have

made a significant contribution to our knowledge of the second phase of the Arian debate and its development—apart from Barnes, H.C. Brennecke and R.P.C. Hanson are but two names that spring to mind—do not figure in the notes. Appended to the translation are lists of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and Constantinople between 325 and 361, of councils and synods between 320 and 361, topographical and prosopographical indexes, and a map of bishoprics mentioned by Sozomen.

Scholars of late antiquity will accept this book with gratitude. However, in view of the long-term nature of the project and the fact that the new GCS texts of Socrates and Sozomen will doubtless lead to publications by other scholars, it would be helpful in subsequent volumes to alert the reader to what has appeared since the previous volumes. This is particularly necessary for updating the general introduction in the first volume for example, the very date of Sozomen's *Church History* could have been debated further on the basis of more recent articles like that of C. Roueché (*Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 37 [1986] 130-2).

Centre for Early Christian Studies
Australian Catholic University
P.O. Box 237
Everton Park 4053

PAULINE ALLEN

Apponius, *Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques*. Tome I. Introduction générale, texte, traduction et notes. Livres I-II. Tome II. Livres IV-VIII. Texte, traduction et notes par Bernard de Vregille, s.j. et Louis Neyrand, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 420-421). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1997. 386 + 348 pp., 260 + 280 F.

En 1986 les deux auteurs du présent ouvrage ont publié une édition critique du Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques d'Apponius. C'est la traduction française qui est l'élémént le plus neuf du livre que nous avons sous les yeux. On peut constater qu'en préparant l'édition critique d'un texte, on requiert une compréhension qui permet d'arriver aisément à une bonne traduction. On ne peut qu'admirer l'exactitude de celle que nous présentons ici.

Dans l'Introduction, les auteurs ont souvent pu renvoyer le lecteur à celle de l'édition de 1986, en particulier pour ce qui touche aux sources manuscrites et à l'établissement du texte (cf. p. 10). En ce qui concerne la

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

tradition textuelle, les auteurs font remarquer que ce texte a eu une histoire curieuse: extrême rareté des manuscrits complets du Commentaire, absence du texte dans la *Patrologia latina*, projets d'éditions successifs, qui ont longtemps avorté. La présente édition reprend le texte critique de 1986 avec quelques corrections, mais sans l'apparat critique.

Dans l'Introduction, les auteurs discutent entre autre la culture profane d'Apponius, sa méthode d'interprétation (Apponius considère le Cantique comme un écrit allégorique, qui parle de l'amour du Christ et de l'Eglise ou encore du Christ et de l'âme chrétienne), et sa théologie (dans ce chapitre, les éditeurs montrent leur connaissance approfondie de ce texte remarquable, déjà admiré par Erasme, lequel a écrit que "personne jusque là n' avait jamais rien écrit de plus solide, de plus exact et de plus saint sur le Cantique des Cantiques") (cf. p. 7).

Les auteurs consacrent une note complémentaire au vocabulaire de l'amour dans ce Commentaire. Ils y arrivent à la conclusion qu'il ne faut pas chercher chez Apponius de significations spéciales et nuancées des mots *amor, caritas, dilectio*. Ils comparent sur ce point l'usage d'Apponius avec celui de Jerôme et de Rufin. Ils auraient mieux fait de le comparer avec celui d'Origène (cf. notre recension du Commentaire sur le Cantique d'Origène, *Vig. Chr.* 46, 1992, 412-417 et "What is love? *Eros* and *Agape* in Early Christian Thought," in: *Arche. A Collection of Patristic Studies* by J.C.M. van Winden, ed. by J. den Boeft and D.T. Runia [Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 41], Leiden, Brill, 1997, 287-306).

On souhaite voir paraître bientôt le troisième volume de cette précieuse édition.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106 J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

P. Évieux, *Isidore de Péluse, Lettres*. Tome I: Lettres 1214-1413, (Sources Chrêtiennes 422). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997. 555 p.

Mit diesem Band beginnt die erste kritische Edition Isidors überhaupt. Die Numerierung der Briefe in 5 Büchern (bei Migne) wird verändert: d.h. die Reihenfolge in den Büchern 1-4 (Migne) soll weiter beibehalten werden, das 5. Buch bilden jetzt die neu numerierten Briefe 1214-1413, was nach P. Évieuxs Meinung die richtige Reihenfolge darstellt. Eine Konkordanz ist der Ausgabe beigegeben. Die Edition hat jetzt zunächst diese neu geordneten Briefe zum Inhalt.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Der Band enthält eine ausführliche Einleitung zum gesamten Briefcorpus (Cp. 1), die historische und geographische Umwelt etwa seiner Wirkungszeit: das macht manches verständlich; Bezeugungen des Werkes aus alter Zeit, eine Art Biographie Isidors—soweit das möglich ist—Beschreibung des Werkes selbst und eine ausführliche Geschichte des Textes: danach folgt der Text von Nr. 1214 an, mit französischer Übersetzung. Erstaunlich, wie wenig sich dieser Band mit der Monographie über Isidor überschneidet.

Die ungeheure Arbeit, die in den beiden erschienen Bänden zu spüren ist, läßt die lange Wartezeit verständlich erscheinen.

10435 *Berlin*, Wörther Strasse 38 URSULA TREU

P. Évieux, *Isidore de Péluse, (Théologie Historique 99)*. Beauchesne, Paris, 1995. XXVII, 444 p.

Isidor von Pelusium lebte etwa von 360-vor 440 in Pelusium, einem Hafen an einem östlichen Nilarm. Wohl als Christ geboren, studierte er in Alexandria, ging dann nach Pelusium zurück; dort weihte ihn Bischof Ammonios (†405) zum Mönch. Mit dessen Nachfolger kam I. nicht aus; schließlich siedelte er in eine Klostersiedlung in Augustamnica um. Von seinen Schriften ist ein Corpus von etwa 2000 Briefen erhalten, von verschiedener Länge. Der Inhalt der Briefe ist so unterschiedlich wie die Adressaten, oft Antworten auf Fragen, Ratschläge, Mahnungen zu einem christlichen Wandel, Attacken gegen Gegner. Die Monographie, die Évieux hier seiner Ausgabe vorausschickt, ist beinahe eine Enzyklopädie: er gibt statistische Übersichten über Zahl und Person der Adressaten, ihre Lokalisierung, einen oft detaillierten Bericht über Leben und Verwaltung in einer ziemlich bedeutenden Stadt, auch von anderen Städten, von den Garnisonen. Er zeigt das Wirken der Kleriker dieser Zeit, er berichtet von kirchl. Ereignissen (so das Konzil v. Ephesus). Aber es sind auch politische Persönlichkeiten genannt (s.z.B. dem Komplex "Le milieu politique," pp. 9-126), seien es solche der Stadt oder auch des Reiches. Stets am bedeutsamsten ist ihm die Kirche und ihre Glieder: fast die Hälfte der Monographie ist diesem Thema gewidmet, d.h. dem Klerus, den Gläubigen und ihrem Wandel. Das Problem des Werkes Isidors, der Überlieferung, der zeitlichen Einordnung, Verzeichnis des Adressaten wird gleichfalls be-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

handelt. An diesem Buch wie auch an der Edition des Textes hat der Autor seit vielen Jahren gearbeitet: daß wir es nun haben dürfen, ist eine große Freude.

10435 *Berlin*, Wörther Strasse 38 URSULA TREU

Arche. A Collection of Patristic Studies by J.C.M. van Winden, edited by J. den Boeft and D.T. Runia (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae xli), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, xiii + 331 pp., ISBN 90-04-10834-3, DFL 180/US $ 112.50 (clothbound with book jacket).

"Introduction" by J. den Boeft & D.T. Runia (ix-xiii)

Part One: The arché in Early Christian Thought: 1. Frühchristliche Bibelexegese. "Der Anfang" (3-48); 2. St. Ambrose's Interpretation of the Concept of Matter (49-58); 3. Some Additional Observations of St. Ambrose's Concept of Matter (59-60); 4. In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretations of Genesis 1,1 (61-77); 5. *In the Beginning: Early Christian Exegesis of the Term archè in Genesis 1:1* (inaugural address) (78-93); 6. The Early Christian Exegesis of "Heaven and Earth" in Genesis 1,1 (94-106); 7. "Terra autem stupida quadam erat admiratione": Reflections on a Remarkable Translation of Genesis 1:2a (107-115); 8. An Appropriate Beginning: the Opening Passage of Saint Basil's *In Hexaemeron* (116-123); 9. *"Idea" and "Matter" in the Early Christian Exegesis of the First Words of Genesis: A Chapter in the Encounter between Greek Philosophy and Christian Thought* (124-145); 10. Notiz über ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ bei Gregor von Nyssa (146-150); 11. Once again *Caelum Caeli*: Is Augustine's Argument in Confessions XII consistent? (151-157).

Part Two: Essays on the Church Fathers: 12. Notes on Origen, *Contra Celsum* (161-173); 13. Origen's Definition of ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑ in *De oratione* 14,2 (174-175); 14. On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetical Treatises (176-180); 15. Grégoire de Nysse, *De anima et resurrectione*, PG 46 17A (181); A Textual Problem in Gregory of Nyssa, *Apologia in Hexaemeron*, ch. 69 (182); 17. A Textual Problem in Gregory of Nyssa's *In sanctum Pascha* (GNO IX,254,8) (183-185); 18. A Christian *Phaedo* (valedictory address) (186-197); 19. Review of C. Apostolopoulos, *Phaedo Christianus* (198-204).

Part Three: Philonica: 20. Quotations from Philo in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* (207-212); 21. The First Fragment of Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesim*

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

(213-218); 22. The World of Ideas in Philo: An Interpretation of *De Opificio Mundi* 24-25 (219-228).

Part Four: Plotiniana: 23. A Crucial Passage in Plotinus, *Enn.* VI 9,7 (231-232); 24. Plotinus, *Enn.* III 7.13.49-53 (233-234); 25. Das EKEI in Plotin Enn. VI 9,7,4 (235-236).

Part Five: Essays on the Relation between Greek and Patristic Thought: 26. The Origin of Falsehood. Some Comments on the Introductory Passage of the Treatise *On the Resurrection of the Dead* Attributed to Athenagoras (239-242); 27. Le Christianisme et la philosophie (243-256); 28. Two Kinds of Logos: Origen against Celsus (257-268); 29. Le portrait de la philosophie grecque dans Justin, *Dialogue* 1,4-5 (269-278); 30. True Philosophy—Ancient Philosophy (279-286); 31. *What is Love? Eros and Agape in Early Christian Thought* (287-300); 32. Review of Origène, *Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (Sources Chrétiennes 375-376) (301-306).

J.C.M. van Winden, Bibliography 1954-1997 (307-321).

Index Locorum (322-331).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adamantius. Dialogue on the True Faith in God: De Recta in Deum Fide, translated with commentary by Robert A. Pretty, edited for publication by Garry W. Trompf (Gnostica 1), [Leuven]: Peeters 1997, xxi + 204 pp., ISBN 90-6831-893-4, BEF 800 (pb).

Arche. A Collection of Patristic Studies by J.C.M. van Winden, edited by J. den Boeft and D.T. Runia (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae xli), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, xiii + 331 pp., ISBN 90-04-10834-3, DFL 180/US $ 112.50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Balicka-Witakowska, Ewa, *La Crucifixion sans Crucifié dans l'art éthiopien. Recherches sur la survie de l'iconographie chrétienne de l'Antiquité tardive* (Bibliotheca nubica et aethiopica. Schriftenreihe zur Kulturgeschichte des Raumes um das Rote Meer, hrsg. von Piotr O. Scholz, Band 4), Warszawa-Wiesbaden: Zas Pan 1997, xii + 188 p. + xvi + 108 illustrations, ISBN 83-901809-4-4, DM 178 (Leinen).

Borgen, Peder, *Philo of Alexandria, An Exegete for His Time* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum LXXXVI), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, x + 332 pp., ISBN 90-04-10388-0, DFL 180/US $ 106 (clothbound with book jacket).

Doignon, Jean, *Sancti Hilarii Pictaviensis Episcopi, Tractatus super Psalmos. Instructio Psalmorum In Psalmos I-XCI* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina LXI), Turnhout: Brepols 1997, cxv + 363 pp., ISBN 2-503-00612-4 (broché), BEF 7250 (broché).

Écrits apocryphes chrétiens, I, édition publiée sous la direction de François Bovon et Pierre Geoltrain, index établis par Sever J. Voicu, Paris: Gallimard 1997, 1782 p., ISBN 2-07-011387-6, FF 450 (relié pleine peau sous couffret illustré).

Fedwick, Paul Jonathan, *Bibliotheca Basiliana Universalis. A Study of the Manuscript Tradition, Translations and Editions of the Works of Basil of Caesarea, II. The Homiliae Morales, Hexaemeron, De Litteris, with additional Coverage of the Letters, Part One: Manuscripts; Part Two: Editions, Translations* (Corpus Christianorum: CCBBU 2,1-2), Turnhout: Brepols 1996, lxiv + 1326 pp. [in two volumes], ISBN 2-503-50520-1 (broché), BEF 9000 + 5500 (broché).

Frishman, Judith & Lucas van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 5), Lovanii: in aedibus Peeters 1997, ix + 290 pp., ISBN 90-6831-920-5, BEF 2100 (clothbound with book jacket).

Garsoïan, Nina G. & Jean-Pierre Mahé, *Des Parthes au Califat. Quatre leçons sur la formation de l'identité arménienne* (Travaux et mémoires du Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Collège de France, Monographies 10), Paris: De Boccard 1997, 119 p., 22 ill., ISBN 2-7018-0105-2, FF 150 (broché).

Gryson, Roger (ed.), *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 12 (Pars II) Esaias, Fascicule 11, Is 65,23—fin. Conclusion: Histoire du texte, Compléments, Tables.* Freiburg: Verlag Herder 1997, pp. 1601-1707, ISBN 3-451-00131-4.

Hammond Bammel, Caroline P. (†), *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes. Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins, Buch 4-6, zum Druck vorbereitet und gesetzt unn H.J. Frede und H. Stanjek* (Vetus Latina, Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel: Aus der Geschichte der

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

lateinischen Bibel, herausgegeben von H.J. Frede und R. Gryson, Band 33), Freiburg: Herder 1997, 283 S., ISBN 3-451-21944-1 (brosch.).

Horn, Christoph (Hrsg.), *Augustinus, De civitate Dei* (Klassiker Auslegen 11), Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1997, vii + 308 S., ISBN 3-05-002871-8, DM 29,80 (pb).

Letsch-Brunner, Silvia, *Marcella—Discipula et Magistra. Auf den Spuren einer römischen Christin des 4. Jahrhunderts* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, Band 91), Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1998, xi + 272 S., ISBN 3-11-015808-6, DM 168 (Leinen).

Merkt, Andreas, *Maximus I. von Turin. Die Verkündigung eines Bischofs der frühen Reichskirche im zeitgeschichtlichen, gesellschaftlichen und liturgischen Kontext* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae xl), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, xviii + 342 pp., ISBN 90-04-10864-5, DFL 200/US $ 118 (clothbound with book jacket).

Meunier, Bernard, *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie. L'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite* (Théologie historique 104), Paris: Beauchesne 1997, xix + 304 p., ISBN 2-7010-1354-2, FF 270 (pb).

Oort, J. van & J. Roldanus (Hrsg.), *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon* (Studien der patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft 4), Leuven: Peeters 1997, x + 223 S., ISBN 90-6831-984-1, BEF 1150 (pb).

Pearson, Birger A., *The Emergence of the Christian Religion: Essays on Early Christianity*, Harrisburg PA: Trinity Press International 1997, xiv + 241 pp., ISBN 1-56338-218-0, US $ 19.00, (pb).

Petersen, William L., Johan S. Vos, Henk J. de Jonge (eds.), *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical. Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum lxxxix), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, xxvi + 344 pp., ISBN 90-04-10380-5, DFL 176/US $ 103,50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Porter, Stanley E. (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1997, xv + 901 pp., ISBN 90-04-09965-4, DFL 430/US $ 253 (clothbound with book jacket).

Romeny, R.B. ter Haar, *A Syrian in Greek Dress. The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 6), Lovanii: in aedibus Peeters 1997, xii + 484 pp., ISBN 90-6831-958-2, BEF 2400 (clothbound with book jacket).

Sachot, Maurice, *L'invention du Christ. Genèse d'une religion*, Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob 1998, 251 pp., ISBN 90-2-7381-0534-3, FF 130 (pb).

Schefold, Karl, *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker.* Neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage unter Mitarbeit von A.-C. Bayard, H.A. Cahn, M. Guggisberg, M.T. Jenny, Ch. Schneider, Basel: Schwabe & Co. AG Verlag 1997, 599 S. mit 331 Abbildungen, ISBN 3-7965-0997-5, SFr 128/DM 150/öS 1090 (Leinen).

Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano, diretta da Gaetano Passarelli, 1,1-2, Roma 1997, Accademia Angelica-Costantiniana di Lettere Arti e Scienze, Circ. Ostiense, 183, 00154 Roma, 188 pp., L 60.000 (pb).

Turner, Martha Lee, *The Gospel according to Philip. The Sources and Coherence of an Early Christian Collection* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 38), Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1996, xi + 283 pp., ISBN 90-04-10443-7. DFL 160.50/US $ 100,50 (clothbound with book jacket).

MARCION AND THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

GILLES QUISPEL

Two recent publications drew my attention to a topic upon which I published many years ago, namely, the New Testament text known to Marcion. It is quite remarkable that no comprehensive study of this topic has ever been published. Within the scope of this article, we can do no more than to offer some brief remarks and underscore some points which might otherwise remain unnoticed.

I. *Two recent investigations*

The first of the two publications which prompted me to return to Marcion was John J. Clabeaux's 1983 Harvard dissertation (published in 1989).[1] Clabeaux discussed a limited number of passages from Marcion's *Apostolikon*, as preserved in two later works: the dialogue of Adamantius, *de recta fide* and Epiphanius in *Panarion* 42, and Tertullian's citations in *Adversus Marcionem* book V. Clabeaux established that Marcion revised only lightly the authoritative, pre-Marcionite Greek text of Paul used and accepted by the ancient Catholic congregation of Rome. Clabeaux pointed out that the readings and variants of this early Roman text agreed as often as not with the *Vetus Latina* manuscripts of Paul—all of which seem to derive (directly or indirectly) from Rome. This was a very important observation, for it led Clabeaux to two important insights. First, it demonstrated that the variants in these secondary (*viz.* Tertullian) and tertiary (*viz.* Epiphanius) witnesses to Marcion's text were *not* variants which were "tendentious corruptions" of the text made by Marcion. How could they be, for the very same variants were often found in the manuscripts of the "orthodox" *Vetus Latina*? Second, since the text of the *Vetus Latina* found in Rome (the "Italic" and "European" sub-groups of the *Vetus Latina*) is regarded as belonging to the

[1] J.J. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul. A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus attested by Marcion*, diss. Harvard 1983, CBQ.S 21 (Washington, D.C. 1989).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998
Vigiliae Christianae 52, 349-360

"Western" text-type, and Marcion's text apparently shared the same variant readings as the *Vetus Latina*, Clabeaux concluded that the pre-Marcionite text of Paul in Rome had been of the "Western" text-type.[2]

The second publication which led me to reconsider this matter was Ulrich Schmid's 1993 Münster dissertation (published in 1995) on Marcion's text of Paul.[3] Schmid followed in the footsteps of Clabeaux: he examined and discussed all of the variants attributed to Marcion by the Catholic heresy-hunters. He too concluded that Tertullian consulted a *Greek* (not a Latin) text of Marcion's *Apostolikon*.[4] Contrary to the received opinion, Schmid also concluded that Marcion's interventions in the text to remove the so-called "Judaistic" interpolations were much less numerous than one would suppose. Schmid based his conclusion on the fact that most of the variants in Marcion's text which depart from the now-accepted text of the Pauline epistles are also attested elsewhere, notably in *Catholic* sources, and are—upon examination—*not* tendentious. The influence of Marcion on the Biblical manuscripts of the Catholic Church is, therefore, minimal, and has often been overrated in the past. In fact, Schmid concluded that the text which Marcion used was essentially the text of Paul as read in the Catholic Church in Rome in Marcion's time. The manuscripts in use in Rome in the 140s cannot have differed much from other manuscripts else-

---

[2] The idea that the most ancient text in the church was the "Western" text-type is not new (see the collection of scholars' statements in W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron, Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, Suppl. to VigChr. 25 [Leiden 1994], 11-12), but it has been shunned because of the obvious problems such a different text (when compared with the Byzantine text-type) presents for both Protestants (*sola scriptura*, but the *scriptura* is not static) or Catholics (the *magisterium* becomes nothing more than the quirks of a particular time, place, and text-type).

[3] U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, ANTT 25 (Berlin/New York 1995).

[4] Long ago, I argued that Tertullian had used a *Greek* copy of Marcion's edition of Paul (cp. G. Quispel, *De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*, diss. Utrecht 1943 (Leiden 1943). My position was *contra* A. von Harnack (*Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gotte, Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der katholischen Kirche* (Leipzig 1923; 2nd edition 1924, photomechanical reprint: Darmstadt 1960), and H. von Soden ("Der Lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian," in *Festgabe für A. Jülicher* [Tübingen 1927], 229-281). My position received little support after publication: I was attacked by A.J.B. Higgins, "The Latin Text in Marcion and Tertullian," *VigChr* 5 (1951), 1-42, and T.P. O'Malley, *Tertullian and the Bible. Language-Imagery, Exegesis*, diss. Nijmegen 1969. Now, however, the work of Clabeaux and Schmid would seem to tip the balance back in favour of the thesis that Tertullian knew and used a Greek Marcion.

where in the ancient church at that time; like them, they must have suffered from scribal errors (like haplography or dittography), and must have undergone redactional corrections. But they probably also preserved remarkable ancient readings which have been neglected by textual critics and editors of the New Testament, readings which might, in some cases, be part of the most ancient recoverable text of Paul. Many of these variants are also found in *Codex Bezae* (D) and the *Vetus Latina* manuscripts of Paul—that is, in the "Western" text. Other variants, however, are not found in the "Western" text; therefore, I will call this pre-Marcionite text of the Catholic congregation in Rome "pre-Western," for it appears to antedate the creation of what we now call the "Western" text.

It is here that the significance of Marcion as a witness to the text of the New Testament becomes apparent. If, as both Clabeaux and Schmid have independently found, Marcionite revisions of the New Testament text were very minor, then Marcion's text would be a valuable witness to the text of the New Testament as known in Rome, prior to 144 (the date of Marcion's expulsion from the Roman church). Marcion's text of the New Testament must be the text known in Rome prior to 144. This means that the manuscript Marcion used is even older than what is usually regarded as the "oldest" extant manuscript of Paul's writings: $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ (± 200, from Egypt). However, a timely warning is necessary now. The results of Clabeaux and Schmid should not be overrated, as if the text of Marcion did not contain any tendentious readings at all.

Tertullian does not mention any variant of Marcion's text in Galatians 1:1: "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father (καὶ θεοῦ πατρός), who raised him from the dead."

However, in his *Commentary on Galatians*, Jerome writes:

> sciendum quoque in Marcionis apostolo non esse scriptum "et per deum patrem" volentis exponere Christum non a deo patre sed per semetipsum suscitatum.
>
> —*In Gal.*, ad loc.[5]

> One should know that in the Pauline corpus of Marcion the words "and through God the Father" have not been written, because he wanted to stress his point that Christ has not been raised by God the Father, but arose spontaneously through his own strength.

[5] Migne, PL 26, 313A, lines 4-7 (also cited in Schmid, 240).

This is a very trustworthy tradition. As a Christo-monistic thinker, Marcion wanted to underline that Jesus rose from the dead without any help from the inferior demiurge.

We may be sure that Marcion intentionally omitted the words καὶ θεοῦ πατρός from his text of Paul's Letter to the Galatians.

On the other hand, it is not *a priori* completely impossible that even at this early date (before 144 C.E.), doctrinal corrections had been introduced into this pre-Western text of Paul's letters.

In his Epistle to the Galatians (2:9), the apostle declares that James, the brother of the Lord, and Peter (Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς), and also John, agreed with Paul and Barnabas that the Antiochenes should go unto the Gentiles, and "they" (the Jerusalemites) should go to the Jews.

When discussing the text of Marcion in the fifth book of *adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian writes:

> bene igitur, quod et dexteras dederunt Petrus et Jacobus et Johannes. . . .
> —*adv.Marc.* V,3,6

> Therefore it is good that Peter and James and John gave the right hands. . . .

The sequence of the names has been inverted: instead of James, it is Peter who is mentioned in the first place. As Schmid observes, elsewhere Tertullian enumerates: Peter and John and James (*adv.Marc.* IV,3,3; *Praesc.* 15,2). That was obviously the reading Tertullian preferred, the text of his own Latin Bible, the *Afra*. The same variant is transmitted by Marius Victorinus.

We may be sure that the sequence "Peter and James" was the variant of Marcion himself. At the same time, it was a typically Western reading, evidenced by the Western manuscripts D F G, the *Itala* manuscripts *a b*, several manuscripts of the Vulgate, the minuscules 629 and 1175, and Latin authors like Ambrosiaster and Pelagius.

Here we face a conundrum: Marcion was no friend of Peter, a "Judaist"; why, then, should he have changed this text in order to give primacy to Peter? Could it be that Marcion simply transmitted the variant reading which he found in the *Corpus Paulinum* at that time and used in Rome, the city where he composed his revision of the "New Testament"? And is it possible that this correction is due to the pen of somebody who wanted to stress that Peter was the primate? At the same time, about 140 C.E., or even before, the Judaic Church affirmed the primacy of James, the brother of the Lord, the Righteous One, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being (*Gospel of Thomas*, log. 12).

II. *Marcion's text of Paul*

Marcion's pre-144 manuscript of Paul (what I shall call the "pre-Marcionite text of Rome") must have contained a number of marginal glosses, for one of them is signaled by Tertullian, when discussing Paul's interpretation (Gal. 4:24-25) of Abraham's sons Ishmael (whose mother was a slave) and Isaac (whose mother was freeborn) as symbols of the Old Covenant with Israel and the New Covenant with the Christian Church. Tertullian writes:

> quae sunt allegorica, id est aliud portendentia: haec enim sunt duo testamenta (sive duo *ostensiones*, sicut invenimus interpretatum)
>
> —Tert., *adv.Marc.* IV,4

Von Harnack supposed that *interpretari* here meant "to translate," and supposed a tendentious elimination of the covenant with Israel as well as the decisive proof that Tertullian read a Latin translation of Marcion's *Apostolicum*, the oldest Christian Latin text known to us.

But διαθήκη can also mean "declaration of God's will," which comes rather nearer to ἀπόδειξις, Latin "ostensio": "proof of God's intervention." That the one word in this context of Galatians could evoke the other is clear from the commentary of Tyconius on the same passage in Galatians:

> Sed quod perspicue duo procreati sunt, *ostensio* est duorum populorum.
>
> But that clearly two children were born, is *proof* that two peoples are meant.
>
> —*Liber regularum* (Burkitt, 28)

Moreover, *interpretari* does not necessarily mean "to translate." It usually means "to explain, to give a special interpretation of something." Therefore, Tertullian, in the passage just cited from *adv.Marc.* IV,4, should be translated as follows:

> These words are typological, that is: pointing to something else; for these are the two covenants (or, as we find it explained in the margin: two *proofs* of God's intervention).

One of the distinctive features of Marcion's *Apostolikon* was its arrangement of the Pauline letters. Tertullian suggests by his continuing commentary on these letters in Book V of *adv.Marc.*, which begins with Galatians (as well as Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42,9,4), that the following was the order of Marcion's Pauline corpus:

> Galatians
> 1-2 Corinthians
> Romans

1-2 Thessalonians
Ephesians (called *Laodiceans* by Marcion)
Colossians
Philippians
Philemon (no Hebrews, 1-2 Timothy, Titus)

A similar sequence is found in the *Kanon Sinaiticus*,[6] a Syrian work:

Galatians
1-2 Corinthians
Romans
Hebrews
Colossians
Ephesians
Philippians
1-2 Thessalonians
2 Timothy
Titus
Philemon

In the course of the centuries some writings have obviously been added. But the "Marcionite" (we would call it: "original") shape of the Pauline corpus has been preserved.

The foregoing suggests that there once was in use in Rome a "deviant" (i.e., deviating from our present text), pre-Marcionite collection of Paul's epistles, and that this ancient, pre-Marcionite deviating text was once transported to Aramaic Christianity.

Perhaps there is still more evidence which points to this fact. The *Cologne Mani Codex*, a biography of Mani (*216-†277) contains many quotations from Paul by Mani and his pupil Baraies. Mani turns out to be a seasoned Paulinist, and proves that a gnostic interpretation of the apostle is quite possible. Hans Dieter Betz has observed, in an excellent article, that these quotations show a strong preference for Galatians and Corinthians.[7] I quote only one:

> So we also know about the apostle Paul that he was caught up to the third heaven (2 Cor. 12:2), as he writes in his Epistle to the Galatians: by Jesus Christ and God the Father (καὶ θεοῦ πατρός).
>
> —*C.M.C.* 60,16 (Koenen-Römer 40)

---

[6] See the "Stichenverzeichnis" of the books of the Old and New Testament, in *Studia Sinaitica*, ed. A.S. Lewis (London 1894), 11-14 (cited by Schmid, 288).

[7] Hans Dieter Betz, "Paul in the Mani Biography (Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis)," in *Codex Manichaeus Coloniensis*, Atti del Simposio Internazionale 3-7 Settembre 1984 (Cosenza 1986), 215ff.

Betz (234) assumes that Mani relied on the canon of Marcion, which began with Galatians and the epistles to the Corinthians, that perhaps he learned his Pauline theology (which is such an important part of his Christian religion) from the Marcionites, and that his close relationship to the apostle Paul was probably due to the influence of Marcion.

However, we have argued in the foregoing pages that the omission of the words καὶ θεοῦ πατρός in Galatians 1:1 was, in fact, a tendentious elimination by Marcion himself. Now we see that the *Cologne Mani Codex* explicitly contains these words. That would seem to indicate that Mani and the Manichaeans did *not* use Marcion's Apostolos.

Moreover, up till this date, not a single tendentious reading of Marcionite origin has been found among the many quotations from Paul in Manichaean sources. One would rather suppose that Mani used a collection of Pauline letters beginning with Galatians, as was used by the Aramaic Church of the East.

Someone may have brought this Roman text to the East. That someone could have been Tatian, the pupil of Justin Martyr in Rome, who left him and returned to his homeland in the East. From quotations in the third book of the *Stromates* of Clement of Alexandria, it is clear that Tatian knew the letters of Paul and gave an Encratite, anti-marriage interpretation of them. We know that the influence of Encratism on Mani was enormous: no meat, no wine, no sex for him. The Diatessaron of Tatian was his Gospel. Mani may have been familiar with Tatian's *Corpus Paulinum* too.

Schmid also discusses the relationship between the pre-Marcionite text of Rome and the "Western" text. He thinks that the ancient, pre-Marcionite Roman text was constituted in the first decades of the second century or even at the end of the first century. The "Western" text of Paul, known through the bilingual *codices* F G H and D/*d*, and the *Vetus Latina* of Paul, seems to have originated from a revision (or several revisions) of the pre-Western, pre-Marcionite text of Paul. Its author accomplished three tasks: (1) he removed the glosses so characteristic of Marcion's text; (2) he consulted other manuscripts of Paul's epistles to constitute his text, and (3) he added the fourteenth chapter of Romans as well as the Pastoral Letters to Timothy and Titus. When and where this happened is left uncertain.

Whether this is so uncertain is open to question, for if the pre-Marcionite text of Paul were written in Rome before 144, it seems plausible that these later redactions of it occurred in the same place.

This suggests a "where": Rome.

III. *Rome and the "Western" text*

All text-types of the New Testament radiated from a city. Constantinople is the centre from which the so-called "Koine" text spread over the Greek and Slavic world for more than a thousand years. It is rightly called the Byzantine text because Byzantium is the old name for Constantinople.

The "Egyptian" text, represented by *Codex Sinaiticus* (ℵ) and *Codex Vaticanus* (B), on which our modern editions of the New Testament are based, is derived from the text of Alexandria, transmitted by the Bodmer Papyrus $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ of Luke and John, and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ of John, which show the fingerprints of experienced scribes, who were familiar with the *Editionstechnik* developed in Alexandria during the previous centuries for the publication of critical editions of Homer and other classics; hence, it is sometimes also called the "Alexandrian" text.

Perhaps there existed also in the Early Church a "Caesarean" text, localized in the beautiful and large city of Caesarea in Palestine, to which *Codex Koridethi* (Θ) and some families of texts written in minuscules, family 1 and 13 (f^1 and f^{13}) are said to belong.

The *Vetus Syra*—with its many distinctive readings and harmonizations—originated in Mesopotamian Edessa, the centre of Aramaic Christianity.

The *Afra*—perhaps the oldest translation of the Bible into Latin—originated in Carthage, the second city of the West.

Was Rome—a literary centre, the capital of the world, a cradle of culture and literature, where a host of *grammatici* in numerous *scriptoria* copied not just classics like Vergil but also lawyers like Gaius (± 150, the author of the important and influential *Institutiones*, who lived in Rome)—was Rome an exception to this rule?[8] I think not. The *codex* had recently been invented there[9] and enthusiastically accepted by the Christians, because a *codex* (book) was so much easier to use than a scroll when looking up a verse or confounding a heretic quoting Scripture to his purpose. The Catholics of Rome must have had their own *scriptorium.*[10] The pre-Marcionite text of Paul's epistles proves it; it shows all the signs of having been written by a professional scribe, with all the scribal errors, emendations and marginal glosses of a normal manuscript. And most likely it was in the form of *a codex.*

---

[8] H.L. Nelson, *Ueberlieferung, Aufbau und Stil von Gai Institutiones* (Leiden 1981).

[9] Colin H. Roberts, *The Codex*, in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. 60 (London 1955).

[10] For a different opinion, see: Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Leiden/Grand Rapids 1987), 54.

Such a *scriptorium* could also produce the "Western" text of Paul's Epistles, as it is transmitted by the bilingual manuscripts F G H, *Codex Claromontanus* (D^p), and the different versions of the *Vetus Latina*. But there is also a Western Text for the four canonical gospels, contained in the copies of the Latin *Itala* and *Afra*, as well as in *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (D) and the Syriac (Aramaic) Codices Sinaiticus (Syr^{sin}) and Curetonianus (Syr^{cur}). The text of Luke's Acts of the Apostles was so heavily edited that its Western revision amounts to a second, revised edition. Only the Apocalypse of John and the so-called Pastoral Letters of James, Peter, and John escaped the hands of Western correctors, which all must have done their work after Marcion (± 144 C.E.), and before the end of the second century, when I suppose that all these writings must have been available. This thorough revision, which amounts almost to a second, definitive edition seems to presuppose the conscious effort of a whole school of *grammatici* to establish a complete and authoritative edition of the Holy Writings. It would seem that all these conditions were present in the Catholic Church of Rome in the second century of our era. The Catholic congregation there could easily produce an authoritative text of Holy Writ during and after the gnostic crisis. The Western Text is a post-Marcionite text. I want to stress the point that the constitution of this text-type was not only a philological, but also a *theological* achievement.

An example of this theological colouring is found in the Pastoral Letters. These were absent from the pre-Marcionite *corpus* of Paul in Rome, but apparently the letters of "Paul" to Timothy and to Titus were added to the canon in this post-Marcionite, "Western Text" canon. The author of Timothy rejects heretics, who pretend that the resurrection has already taken place (2 Timothy 2:13). But this was what Valentinus (or one of his disciples?) was teaching in his *Epistle to Rheginos* on the resurrection:

> . . . come away from the divisions and the bonds and *already thou hast the resurrection.*
>
> —*Ep. ad Rheg.* 49.13-15

The "Paul" of 1 Timothy also warns against dissidents who forbid marriage and command abstinence from meats which God has created (1 Timothy 4:3). That was certainly a timely warning welcomed by Catholics in Rome when the Encratite Tatian ("no wine, no meat, no sex") was present in Rome or had just left!

And what a God-sent gift for a true believer to read in his (new) "authoritative" Bible that the apostle Paul himself had warned against the oppositions

(ἀντιθέσεις) of the Gnosis falsely called so (1 Tim. 6:20): remember that Marcion had just published, after 144 in Rome, his *Antitheseis* about the contradictions between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Thus Paul was "defended" against his best friends, vindicated for orthodoxy and encapsulated in Catholicism, all in and by the authors of the Western Text.

All of these features in the post-Marcionite canon of the "Western" Text answer or solve problems which were acute in Rome in the middle of the second century. The Western Text is, therefore, likely a Roman creation, because it is clearly responding to the challenges of Valentinus and Marcion and others who had such impact there in the mid-second century: this would appear to be one case where the oft-dangerous dictum *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* would seem to hold true.

The origin of the Western Text in Rome becomes more plausible when seen against the background of the grand design of Catholic Rome to throw up three dikes in order to protect the true religion:

1) an Apostolic Confession of Faith, written by the disciples of Jesus, which was once a simple baptismal creed in Rome;
2) an Apostolic Canon of inspired and authentic writings about Jesus Christ, linked with the Septuagint;
3) the Apostolic Succession of the bishops, which guaranteed the truth of tradition and a correct interpretation of the Bible.

It is necessary to say that during this period the most important decision was to link this New Testament with the Septuagint, a Hellenistic collection of Greek and originally Hebrew writings, which was neither identical with Jerome's Vulgate and its *hebraica veritas*, nor with any modern Bible. Marcion, Valentinus, and Marcellina, the female teacher of the *Gnostikoi* (a specific sect), who had come to Rome under the episcopacy of Anicetus (155-166) and had converted many Christians there (Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* I.25.6); they all rejected the Old Testament in the form of the Septuagint.

To the three pillars above, one might add a fourth pillar to Roman Christianity: the creation of an authoritative redaction of the scriptures in the "Western" Text, a text which was specifically pointed at her opponents. Seen in this historical context, the Western Text appears to be both Roman (it answers the controversies so acute there) and Catholic (its answers/solutions are those which became "normative" in geographically western Christianity). The process of creating and introducing the "Western" Text was virtually complete about the year 200, for both Irenaeus and Tertullian have a typically "Western" Text.

IV. *Provisional Conclusions*

1) Marcion's non-doctrinal interventions in the text he took over from the ancient Roman Christian community were minor: he was a reformer, not a philologist. The Greek text of Luke and Paul, upon which Marcion performed his redaction, was the standard text in Rome at the time when he began his revisions (*e.g.*, circa 144, when he was excommunicated from the congregation in the capital). This text was, of course, pre-Marcionite; it was also pre-Western, and constituted before 144. It had been written down by an experienced Catholic *grammaticus*, who had, of course, his own *scriptorium*, and who made mistakes and scribal errors, like all scribes, but also opted for a better variant after having consulted another source: this scribe must have been familiar with all the methods of the classical techniques of edition, which flourished not only in Alexandria, but also in Rome.

2) It is quite possible that Tatian, when leaving Rome (*c.* 172 C.E.) after the death of Justin Martyr, took this pre-Marcionite, pre-Western text with him to the East, and used it for his great work of harmonization, the "one out of four"—the Diatessaron. This would explain why both Catholic and Manichaean authors of a later date *in the East* seem to have had a *Corpus Paulinum* beginning with the Epistle to the Galatians and the two Epistles to the Corinthians, *as in Rome.*

As Schmid (236) has shown, there is only one testimony for this sequence in the whole Greco-Roman world: the so-called *Marcionite Prologues* to the letters of Paul, which, perhaps, are not Marcionite at all, and which certainly reflect the order of the pre-Marcionite *Corpus Paulinum* then used in Rome.

Because they may reproduce the text known in Rome before 144 C.E., variant readings in the text of Marcion should be examined very carefully. To dismiss all of them, *a priori*, as "tendentious variants" introduced by Marcion himself, is an error of the most basic sort, for it means one has failed to attempt to separate the wheat from the chaff.

3) This pre-Marcionite, pre-Western text of Rome and, consequently, the "Western Text," which also originated in Rome, seem to have been influenced by a Judaic-Christian gospel tradition transmitted by a limited number of *logia* contained in the *Gospel of Thomas* and also by gospel quotations in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.[11] One may think of the many

[11] K.A. Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (Halle 1832). J. van Amersfoort, "The Gospel of Thomas and the Western Text. A Reappraisal," in G. Quispel, *Gnostic Studies*, Vol. 2, UNHAII 24,2 (Istanbul 1975).

Western interpolations in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D), a representative of the Western Text. The most famous of them is probably Luke 6:5:

> On the same day he saw a man working on the Sabbath. He said to him: "Man, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed; if you do not, you are cursed and a transgressor of the Law."

This extremely profound summary of a truly Christian ethic presupposes that the Law is still valid. Jewish Christians, who were Law abiding, had no reason to reject it. It was probably transmitted by a Jewish-Christian source.

The many Semitisms—or rather, Aramaisms—in the Western Text, which Matthew Black[12] identified long ago, with great learning, originality, and precision, often give one the impression that sometimes they are nearer to the source and represent a better tradition than their counterparts in the canonical gospels. Might this be because they come from the primitive, pre-Marcionite, pre-Western version of the scriptures current in Rome, pre-144?

NL 3722 BR *Bilthoven*, N. Houdringelaan 32

[12] M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford ³1967).

THE SUBTLETY OF TERTULLIAN

BY

ERIC OSBORN

To many readers, Tertullian is not a subtle writer. R.B. Tollinton was keen to receive Clement of Alexandria into the Anglo-Saxon tradition; "in his distrust of extremes, in his love of peace, in his reverent and sober piety, he anticipates some of the best characteristics of our race."[1] On this inaccurate approach, Tertullian would fit easier into the alternative John Bull tradition. His bluntness with Marcion was part of his cultural setting,[2] but showed a wicked skill. Against Marcion's bodiless, docetic Christ, he argued that it would be easier to find a man like Marcion without heart and brains, than to find a man without a body (*Marc.*4.10.16).

Apologetic takes its targets separately so that argument against one target may not fit easily with argument against another. This is still evident in modern times where writers may exhibit great diversity in responding to objections within one culture, let alone venturing outside that culture.[3] Tertullian successively takes many targets in his sights and acquits himself with such thoroughness that most targets are destroyed. Yet his readers, who admire his respect for contingency, have wondered how it all might fit together.

When a respect for problems and argument is shown, Tertullian's thought fits together remarkably well. Strangely, it is possible to read him for many years without noting how frequently his brief comments balance up the excessive vigour of his extended arguments. Subtlety and surprise are part of his offering to the careful reader. *Ratio* is his favourite word and his paradoxes are rhetorical, always capable of rational resolution. As a Stoic, he prized Heraclitus as much as did the Platonist Clement of Alexandria.

---

[1] R.B. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria, A study in Christian Liberalism* (London, 1914), 2, 283.

[2] Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *The lives of the philosophers*, 6.53.

[3] Some (like J.A.T. Robinson in "*Honest to God*") argued first for a vanished theism, others (like Küng) took their beginning from Jesus (*Christ Sein*) and his message. Robinson came later to christology and Küng went on to the question of God (*Existiert Gott?*).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Justin recognised Heraclitus as a Christian before Christ (1*apol.*46).[4] Tertullian's satire helped his arguments to win over waverers in his day; in modern times it tempts the lazy reader to skim over his argument. The history of ideas is no longer a respectable pursuit when a thinker's conclusions are divorced from his arguments; yet that divorce is common in patristic study where conciliar discussions are read back into earlier writers and ecclesiastical debate takes the place of extended argument. Without extended analysis no writer is comprehensible; rational reconstruction is a protracted but necessary means to that understanding which is the scholar's concern.[5] Analysis carries no guarantee of accuracy, because all scholars miss things through conceptual parochialism or intellectual frailty, and because (within limits) things may be read differently;[6] but there are no human pursuits from which human fallibility may be excluded.

1 *Tertullian and the Jews*

In his *Adversus Judaeos*, Tertullian sets out the failure of the Jews and the fulfilment of God's triumph through the spread of the Christian faith. More than once, he links the dispersion and distress of Jews to their crucifixion of the son of God. Their scriptures are no longer theirs, but have passed to Christians who read them with understanding. Hardness of Jewish hearts explains the hardships of Jewish history. Yet in *pud.*8, he discusses whether the Christian might be the elder brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son, since the Christian takes precedence over the Jew. He rejects this interpretation. It is not possible so to identify the elder brother, for the Christian cannot object, as does the elder son, to the return and restoration of a wayward sibling. Indeed the Christian rejoices at the prospect of

---

[4] Christian spirituality has commonly turned to Platonism. There is another strain which is found in the Heraclitean Stoicism of Tertullian and Irenaeus. It is joined in Origen and Augustine to Platonism, so that we have, in Daniélou's words, "a Stoic world under a Platonic heaven." See the answer to secularism in John Milbank (*Theology and social theory*, Oxford, 1990) who finds his most powerful argument in the cosmic peace of Augustine's Stoic City of God.

[5] As distinct from the awarding of prizes. On the distinction between rational and historical reconstruction see R. Rorty, The historiography of philosophy: four genres, in *Philosophy in History*, ed. R. Rorty, J.B. Schneewind, Quentin Skinner (Cambridge, 1984), 49.

[6] "No agent can eventually be said to have meant or done something which he could never be brought to accept as a correct description of what he had meant to do." Q. Skinner, Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas, *HTh* 8 (1969), 28.

Jewish restitution and links the hope by which the Christian lives to the hope of Israel's salvation. Christianum enim de restitutione Judaei gaudere et non dolere conveniet, siquidem tota spes nostra cum reliqua Israelis expectatione coniuncta est.[7]

2 *Defending the bible*

Tertullian's defence of Old Testament laws and history is excessive and unreasonable. Elisha and the bears (2 Kings 2.23 f.) is a story which does no credit to any God. The evident gluttony of the two she-bears who destroyed forty two children may be mitigated on the grounds that they tore apart, without necessarily swallowing their victims. Tertullian's defence that the children were cheeky youngsters and not lovable infants is worth little. Yet Tertullian's defence of the Old Testament is based on stronger humane grounds and this discloses a redeeming subtlety. He defends the creator because of the goodness of creation which inspires one of his many memorable passages.

"It was goodness who spoke, it was goodness who formed man out of clay into that noble substance of flesh, a substance built out of one material to possess all those many attributes. It was goodness that breathed soul into him—not dead soul but living. Goodness gave him dominion over all things, to enjoy, to govern, and even to give them names. Still more it was goodness that gave man additional delights, so that although in possession of the whole world he had his dwelling in the more salubrious parts of it: so he was translated to paradise, which meant that, already at that stage, he had moved out of the world into the Church. The same goodness also sought out a help for him, so that no good thing might be lacking: 'It is not good,' he said, 'that the man should be alone.' He foreknew

[7] Tota, spes, nostra, are three of Tertullian's important words, and are used frequently to express central elements of his theology. He uses "tota" to refer to the universality, entire disgrace and perfection of the gospel: Totum denique dei mei penes vos dedecus sacramentum est humanae salutis, *Marc.*2.27.7. "Spes" defines his constant orientation to the final judgement and his dominant eschatology: Parce unicae spei totius orbis . . . Salvus sum si non confundar de domino meo, *carn.*5.3. "Nostra" is the epitome of his ecclesiology which points to the solidarity of Christians with one another and with their Lord. The *Apologeticum* is marked by the first person plural of the personal pronoun and its possessive adjective. If the incarnation be denied, falsa est igitur et fides nostra, et phantasma erit totum quod speramus a Christo, *carn.*5.3.

that the femininity of Mary, and subsequently of the Church, would be to man's advantage."[8] Tertullian will not abandon the good creator and defends every part of the creator's story.

3 *Justifying the ways of God*

Worse than his defence of Old Testament laws and narrative is his acceptance of the Deuteronomic theodicy according to which God punishes the wicked and heals the faithful and virtuous. This means that God is always in control and is accessible at every point of life. If all goes well for any human, God is rewarding and healing in return for obedient faithfulness. If suffering comes, he is punishing the sin of the sufferer (*Marc.*2.14.1). To this terrible creed, Tertullian adds a few words which change the face of the God he demeans: for our healing, "God himself died" (*Marc.*2.16.3). Here a brief comment inverts the argument.

4 *Marriage and disaster*

Marriage does not shine in Tertullian's letter to his wife. The arguments against remarriage spell out the miseries and limitations of this state. Then, at the end of the work, he presents a transforming argument, which is that the happiness and blessing of Christian marriage, as he and his wife have known it, could never be repeated with another partner; the very excellence of their gift of shared life and worship makes an attempt at repetition unwise. The angels in heaven tell of the blessedness of such a marriage where, united in flesh and spirit, two people share in prayer and service to God, in the joy and peace of Christ (*ux.*2.8.6-9). Once again, a single stroke of the brush changes the picture which Tertullian presents.

5 *The use of satire*

Tertullian's treatment of the Valentinians sounds insensitive to ears which have heard the findings of Nag Hammadi. He offers nothing but satire and he ridicules the stories which had a higher meaning for all who had higher knowledge. Here, however, he is only making one point. The Gnostic defence (that their beliefs are above reason) robs Tertullian of an opportunity for the rational attack in which he customarily engages. Hermogenes

[8] *Marc.*2.4. Evans' translation modified.

presented argument and Tertullian enjoyed working through his reasoned claims. This was not possible with Valentinians, so he made the one decisive point: whatever is above reason may also be below it. Immunity from argument can justify the most foolish beliefs and should not be claimed by any sensible defender, except as a last resort. At the same time, he is ready to learn something from his victim, for he takes into his account of trinity an element of Valentinian belief and transforms it to suit his purpose (*Prax.*8.1).

6 *Resurrection of flesh*

Tertullian's own adultery underlines the physical nature of the resurrection. The body, which had sinned, will be restored and will stand before its judge in continuity and transformed identity with the earthly body. Who has not seen a battered ship limp into harbour and watched its restoration until that the same vessel again rode the waves in beauty? Such is the transformation of the human flesh. Yet the same ship and the same flesh preserve their identity and there is no break in the process. The final transformation, when God becomes all in all, strains the credulity of most humans. Yet such scepticism, says Tertullian, ignores the central truth that humanity does not have to be fitted into the *eschaton* but the *eschaton* has to be fitted around humanity (*res.*59). The resurrection of humans does not have to fit into a future plan; rather the future plan has to fit around those for whom God makes all things new, when recapitulation takes up each single life. As Paul declares, the world, life, death, things present and things to come, all are ours (1 Cor. 3:22). That same flesh in which we now live shall see God (*res.*59.3). The joining of flesh to spirit has already been consummated in Christ (*res.*63.1 f.). Because in him the two natures have been joined, we too shall rise. Flesh and spirit are joined as bridegroom and bride.

Tertullian's insistence that the future be built around humanity declares a central evangelical truth, which outflanks the stubborn imagery; once again, a single comment subtly transforms the argument.

7 *Athens and Jerusalem*

Tertullian's famous rejection of Athens in favour of Jerusalem (*praescr.*7.9) savours of fideism and contradicts his own frequent appropriation of philosophical ideas. Is it merely a rhetorical ploy or is there argument embedded in the treatise? The extended argument of *de praescriptione* has an evolutionary theme which subtly provides its strength. Athens is all right on the

way to Jerusalem but it can never, as heretics falsely claim, offer any advance beyond the gospel which belongs to Jerusalem. Seneca is *saepe noster* but we are never his. The divine economy moves in one direction. It is as foolish to try to improve the gospel with philosophy as it was for the Galatians to improve it with the Mosaic law.

8 *Credible ineptitude*

Tertullian's most famous paradox, "credibile quia ineptum" (*carn.*5.4), has been taken as a fideist manifesto and misquoted as "credo quia absurdum." Here again analysis of the argument in the text reveals a subtlety of meaning which destroys the common misconception. Tertullian is not arguing for an incarnation[9] but arguing against a Marcionite incarnation which involved a human appearance but no human body. This kind of compromise will not do. God is the author of creation and man is the final step of creation. God is Alpha and man is Omega. A true incarnation must involve true God and true man, Alpha and Omega, which is inept. If the ineptitude is reduced by denying full humanity, so that Alpha is joined to Psi, or by denying full divinity so that Beta is joined to Omega, there is no incarnation. Beta is not Alpha, Psi is not Omega. Either God is no longer God or man is no longer man. Once an incarnation is proposed, ineptitude is a test of truth; elsewhere for Tertullian ineptitude points to falsehood. Here the simple argument of Tertullian reveals a subtlety which most interpreters have passed over.

9 *Originality and tradition*

Few writers have a greater claim to originality than has Tertullian. None has a greater respect for the tradition of the church. Many interpreters would claim this as yet another unresolved conflict in a troubled mind. Tertullian anticipates this difficulty and believes that it is only within a tradition that originality is possible. Marcion is not original but simply deviant because he has abandoned the apostolic tradition.[10] Jesus is original because

---

[9] As was wrongly assumed by the eminent philosopher, Bernard Williams, Tertullian's Paradox, in A. Flew and A. Macintyre (eds.), *New essays in philosophical theology* (London, 1955), 187-211.

[10] ut hinc iam destinari possit haereticus qui deserto quod prius fuerat id postea sibi elegerit quod retro non erat. *Marc.*1.1.

he does not abandon the tradition of Moses and the prophets but transforms it. Every day there was competition to be first in the queue outside the baths of Carthage. This was Marcion's false conception of novelty; on the contrary, novelty was less a matter of timing than a fresh understanding of ancient truth, because antiquity was a mark of truth (*Marc.*1.8-10, 3.3 and 5.19).

10 *Adultery and excommunication*

Tertullian's objection to episcopal rule was intransigent on the question of readmission of adulterers to communion. No penance was available to provide their reinstatement. Yet the "pontifex scilicet maximus" has declared "ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta paenitentia functis dimitto" (*pud.*1.6). The church, as the virgin betrothed to Christ, cannot utter this proclamation; she has none to whom she might promise this remission and, even if she had, she would not make the promise. While the earthly temple may be called a "den of thieves", it could never become a den of adulterers and fornicators (*pud.*1.9).

Tertullian did not regard his own adultery as trivial (he would meet his judge in the same flesh in which he had committed this sin), yet his intransigence on this point is not due to a wounded conscience. He had good reason for believing that such compromise was foreign to the tradition of the church. As elsewhere, his starting point was profoundly positive, not negative. Herein lay the subtlety of his claim. Baptism was a new beginning and a miraculous transformation of sinful human nature (*pud.*6.16-8). When the Word became flesh, there was correction from incontinence to endurance, from sweet fruit to bitter, from hell to heaven, from lust to holiness. Made pure by the waters of baptism the flesh which is in Christ "has lost its primitive filth, is now something different, emerging in a new state, no longer propagated from the slime of natural seed, nor the excrement of lust, but from 'pure water' and 'a clean spirit'" (*pud.*6.16).[11]

Now that it is the body of Christ, a member of Christ and the temple of God, it cannot claim pardon on grounds of earlier precedent. From the moment when it was transformed, to put on Christ as redeemed by the blood of the lamb who is lord, it moved into a new framework of time.

---

[11] exinde caro quaecumque in Christo reliquas sordes pristinas soluit, alia iam res est, nova emergit, iam non ex seminis limo, non ex concupiscentiae fimo, sed ex aqua pura et spiritu mundo.

The simplicity and power of baptism are a constant source of wonder (*bapt.*1 f.).

11 *Imagery and argument*

From time to time, scholars are reminded of the inadequacy of argument without imagery, or logic without metaphor.[12] Tertullian's arguments are held together by many powerful images. Everything happens under the final judgement of God. When Rome condemns, a higher judge absolves. Life is lived in light of the moment when the Christian stands before his lord of whom he has not been ashamed. In love and goodness, the divine potter fashioned man from clay. Our maker is our remaker. The resurrection body is like a ship, once battered by storms, now refitted and gracefully riding the waves. The world is not a pale copy of eternity, but a beautiful and moving Heraclitean flux, in which God has always been active.

God and humanity are Alpha and Omega so that their union is inept; if we think that such union is impossible we have not begun to understand the nearness of God, for whom only the categories of intimate friendship will suffice.[13] The Christian soldier fights for Christus Victor who has fought on his behalf. The heavenly city visibly hovers over the earth. The world is governed by the strife of opposites which tell out the glory of God. As an English poet writes:

> 'Glory be to God for dappled things—
> For skies of couple-colour as a brinded cow;
> For rose-moles all in stipple upon trout that swim;
> Fresh-firecoal chestnut-falls; finches' wings;
> Landscape plotted and pieced-fold, fallow, and plough;
> And áll trádes, their gear and tackle and trim . . .
> All things counter, original, spare, strange;
> Whatever is fickle, freckled (who knows how?)
> With swift, slow; sweet, sour; adazzle dim;
> He fathers-forth whose beauty is past change;
> Praise him.[14]

---

[12] For example, by Frances Young, in Allegory and atonement, *A.B.R.* XXXV, (1987), 107-14.

[13] First person possessive adjectives abound—dominus meus, deus meus.

[14] Pied beauty, G.M. Hopkins, *Poems and Prose of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. W.H. Gardner (Penguin Books, 1953), 30.

12 *The laughing Stoic?*

Tertullian's combination of originality and tradition with a mind entirely formed by the Stoic culture of his time is both unexpected and subtle. If we place Marcus Aurelius beside Tertullian and Celsus beside Clement of Alexandria we are struck by the similarities between the pagan and Christian Stoic and between the pagan and Christian Platonist. For Marcus Aurelius, the world is a living rational unity, within which man lives according to nature and in obedience to reason and law. Its constant change allows him to remain forever young. Human autonomy remains invincible within the everflowing stream and pursues one thing only, virtue, intimate with God and joined by friendship with the human race.[15] Traces of all these elements and their general orientation, are found again in Tertullian; they are not directly borrowed, but reflect the mental environment in which Tertullian lived. He repudiates the idea of a Christian Stoicism (*praescr.* 7.9-11).

Conclusion

In arguing for the subtlety of Tertullian, I indicate the results of analysis of his arguments, in the hope that he may be better understood. This does not mean that his answers to problems are timelessly valid, for problems change and transposition from one decade to another or from one century to another is no substitute for thought. But the analysis of the arguments of other thinkers can free us from our conceptual parochialism and stimulate our thinking. It can enlarge our view of an issue and provoke a new reply. There are times when Tertullian does say things better than most others have done, as in his account of the trinity or his epistemology, and for these we may be grateful; but sometimes the failures of a thinker can be as helpful as his successes. For example, Tertullian's adoption of the Deuteronomic theodicy, despite its modification above, indicates a persistent problem for Christians. While many early fathers went, like Augustine, to Job (who conquered on the dungheap when Adam had been defeated in the garden)[16] for their understanding of Christ, Christian worship cannot abandon those Psalms and histories which go in the opposite direction towards triumphalism. Triumphalism convinces no one. "The

[15] M. Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme* (Gembloux, 1973), 88-98.

[16] *Enarr. in Psalmos*, 29.7; 47.9 et *passim.*

good ended happily, and the bad unhappily. That is what Fiction means."[17] Where Tertullian failed, he illuminates the folly of those who still propound the inevitable prosperity of the virtuous. For the study of any writer does not end in the awarding or withholding of a prize, but in the deeper understanding of the problems which he tackled, through the arguments which he used.

P.O. Box 20, *Point Lonsdale*, Vic 3225, Australia

[17] Oscar Wilde, *The Importance of Being Earnest* (1895) Act 2.

NOTES ON THE POEMS OF PAULINUS NOLANUS

BY

W.S. WATT

The standard edition is that of W. von Hartel, in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 30 (Vienna 1894), which is a vast improvement on its predecessor, that of J.P. Migne (Paris 1861). To accompany his edition Hartel published a monograph, *Patristische Studien VI*, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 132 (Vienna 1895), which I designate by "Hartel[1]" followed by a page-reference. I also give page-references to the article of D.R. Shackleton Bailey in *AJP* 97 (1976) 3-19. I have used the English translation of P.G. Walsh in the *Ancient Christian Writers* series, No. 40 (New York 1975), and am indebted to it for some phrases in my translations.

2,6-7 at mihi uix *alto* uada per saxosa profundo
rarus in obscura generatur sphondylus alga.

Paulinus has just received from a friend a present of some excellent fish. With these he contrasts the produce of his own part of the coast, "scarce a mussel or two, spawned amid the rocky shallows in the dark seaweed." *Alto profundo*, "in the deep sea," is inconsistent with *uada per saxosa*; hence Shackleton Bailey (p. 3) emends *alto* to *lato*, "broad," "extensive." I suggest that *arto*, "narrow," "confined," would fit the context much better; the two words are variants at Ovid, *Trist.* I 10,36 and 47, and elsewhere.

5,54-57 confessam dignare animam si membra caduca
execror et tacitum si paenitet altaque sensus
formido excruciat, tormentaque sera gehennae
anticipat patiturque suos mens *saucia* manes.

A sentence from Paulinus's prayer: "Deem worthy my repentant soul as I abhor my perishable limbs and feel silent remorse, and deep fear tortures my thoughts and my *wounded* heart anticipates the final tortures of hell and suffers its own punishment."

Turnebus's conjecture *mens conscia* ("guilty conscience") is much more

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

germane to the context than *mens saucia* (where *saucia* has no obvious appropriateness), and should stand in the text. It has been undervalued, perhaps for palaeographical reasons, but the corruption is easy to explain: after the loss of the *con*-symbol (for similar small lacunae see Hartel[1] 23 ff.), the remnant *scia* was erroneously expanded to *saucia* to mend the metre.

6,236-239 quis locus hic uitiis? aditum quem praua cupido
inuenit haec inter sacrae ad penetralia mentis?
quo peccet qui nil cupiat? quo *tendat* iniqui
in latebras sensus quisquis non indiget ullo?

John the Baptist in the wilderness: "What room is there here for vices? What entry in these surroundings can wicked desire find to the inner recesses of a holy heart? In what could he sin who desires nothing?" The last sentence is thus translated by Walsh: "How could a man who requires nothing retire into the secret haunts of wicked thoughts?" A. Hudson-Williams (*CQ* 27 [1977] 454) rightly doubts whether a man can be said to "retire into the secret haunts of wicked thoughts," and proposes to change *iniqui* to *iniquum* (substantival, subject of *tendat*): "how could wrongdoing make its way into the secret places of his faculties [sc. *ei*] whoso needs nothing?" This to my mind is even less plausible: *iniquum tendat* is a very surprising expression, and the change of subject wrecks the parallelism between this question and that which immediately precedes. In his apparatus Hartel reports a more promising idea, *illecebras* for *in latebras* (the sole manuscript in fact has *in lacebras*). It only remains to find a suitable verb, in place of *tendat*, to govern *illecebras*; I suggest *<of>fendat*: "where [*sc.* in the wilderness; *quo* = *ubi*, as elsewhere in Paulinus] would he come across enticements to wicked thoughts?"

6,320-323 prima tibi dandae ueniae permissa potestas.
te cum multa nouae peterent *miracula* plebis,
de te Christus ait: "†prophetis† uisere talem
qualem nulla prius uiderunt saecla prophetam."

The poet addresses John the Baptist.

"When numerous miracles bestowed on His new people sought their realisation in you" is Walsh's translation of line 321. I do not believe that miracles could be said to "seek out" or "make for" a person; in any case John the Baptist was not associated with miracles (*signum nullum fecit* John 10,41). I take the relevant passage in Scripture to be Matth. 3,5 f. *tunc exibat ad eum Hierosolyma et omnis Iudaea et omnis regio circa Iordanem, et baptizabantur in Iordane flumine ab eo*. I think that *nouae* refers to conversion and baptism

(cf. 31,4 *nouus aquis*), and that *miracula* is an erroneous expansion of *milia* designed to fill up the line after the loss of a small word like *pede* or *cito*: "when many thousands of the populace renewed hastened to seek you out."

In 322 *prophetis* is clearly an anticipation of *prophetam* in 323. It has been traditional to restore *concessum est* ("it has been granted"), but there can be no certainty about the restoration; Hartel suggested *properetis* ("you must hurry to look upon a prophet such as no ages have previously seen"), but the original word need not have borne a very close resemblance to *prophetis*.

8,1-3 cur gentes fremuere et inania cur meditati
sunt populi? adstiterunt proceres cum regibus *acti*
aduersum dominum et Christum uesana frementes.

This is the beginning of a versification of *Psalm* 2 ("Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?"). The Vulgate version of verse 2 is *astiterunt reges terrae, et principes conuenerunt in unum adversus dominum et adversus christum eius*. I presume that *acti* is taken to mean "driven" (as at 17,53), construed with what follows, but that gives very odd sense both in itself and in combination with *adstiterunt*; I suggest that it should be *alti*; cf. 24,460 and 462; 31,523 *alta* (= *altos*) *mundi*, "the exalted."

10,103-106 defore me patriis tota trieteride terris
atque alium legisse uagis erroribus orbem,
culta prius uestrae oblitum consortia uitae,
increpitas sanctis *mota* pietate querelis.

Ausonius has complained to Paulinus about his three-year absence from home. Paulinus replies: "You chide me with being absent from my fatherland for a whole three-year period, and for traversing another part of the world in aimless wanderings, forgetful of that sharing in your life which I previously kept up." The last line is thus rendered by H.G. Evelyn White (Loeb edition of Ausonius, Vol. 2, p. 131): "thou dost reproach me with complaints hallowed by the love whence they spring"; and thus by Walsh: "your affection is roused to utter complaints worthy of respect, and you rebuke me." Neither of these gives a credible rendering of *mota*, and indeed I think that no credible rendering is possible, and that it should be changed, not to *nota* (an old conjecture), but to *multa*; this corruption, easy enough in itself, would be particularly so here with *motus* occurring in the next line. For the expression cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2,429 f. *plurima pietas*. Whether one construes *multa pietate* with *sanctis* (cf. Evelyn White above) or as an ablative of quality makes little difference.

10,226-230 an credis Hiberae
has telluris opes, Hispani nescius orbis,
quo grauis ille poli sub pondere constitit Atlans,
ultima *nunc eius* mons portio metaque terrae,
discludit bimarem celso qui uertice Calpen?

Paulinus counters Ausonius's disparagement of Spanish towns: "Do you believe that these are the wealth of the Spanish country, ignorant as you are of the region of Spain, where under the weight of the heavy sky stands great Atlas, the mountain which now is the last part and boundary of that land, and which with its lofty peak shuts off Calpe [Gibraltar] situated on two seas."

This passage is dealt with by Shackleton Bailey (pp. 6 f.). He would substitute *qua* for *quo*, but in late Latin *quo* can be used in the sense of *ubi*, as it is at 6,238 and 16,138 f. With greater justification he rejects both *nunc* (which is certainly otiose) and *eius* (*eius terrae* would be Spain, but Atlas is generally regarded as an African mountain); in place of *nunc eius* he proposes *Marmaricae*, which seems to me to be a very long shot. My suggestion would be *<to>tius terrae* ("the whole earth"); then *nunc* would be a stopgap to repair the loss (for an obvious reason) of the first two letters of *totius*. At 206 f. above it is said that Spain *summum . . . in orbem/usque patet* ("stretches right to the end of the earth"), and just below (238) it is described as *finem ponens in limite mundi* ("setting its boundary at the edge of the world").

11,49-56 ego te per omne quod datum mortalibus
et destinatum saeculum est,
claudente donec continebor corpore,
discernar orbe quolibet,
53 nec ab *orbe* longe nec remotum lumine
tenebo fibris insitum,
uidebo corde, mente conplectar pia
ubique praesentem mihi.

Paulinus to Ausonius: "Through all the span of time which is bestowed upon and ordained for mortals, for so long as I shall be penned in by my confining body, by whatever stretch of the world I shall be parted from you, you shall not be far removed from my [*orbe*] nor from my sight. I shall hold you planted in my inmost being, I shall see you with my heart, I shall embrace you, ever present to me, with devoted mind."

Line 53 is not satisfactory; some poor conjectures will be found in Hartel's apparatus and in Shackleton Bailey (p. 7). There seems little doubt that *orbe* is an erroneous repetition from the preceding line; the obvious partner

for *lumine* ("eyes") is *aure* ("ears"; singular as at 24,12). Paulinus imagines that he can still hear his friend's voice and see his friend's face.

15,126-130 tunc magis atque magis quaesito antistite Felix
claruit obpositus gladiis solusque fidei
inuidia effectus, nec spectabatur honore:
maior honore fides, quia tantum causa fidei.
130 tunc petitur, sua cum draco liuidus excitat arma.

These lines have been misinterpreted at more than one point. I translate (removing the disastrous stop which the traditional text places at the end of 129): "Then in the absence of the bishop Felix became more and more prominent in his opposition to the swords, and he by himself came to personify the hatred meted out to the faith; and it was not because of his office that he was conspicuous; more important than office is the faith, because it is only the cause of the faith which is attacked when the jealous dragon sets his weapons in motion."

17,121-124 undique adludent patulo *uerentes*
ore delphines; sine uoce quamquam,
aemula humanis tamen eloquentur
gaudia linguis.

Paulinus imagines the dolphins "on all sides disporting with open mouths" about Nicetas's ship; "voiceless though they are, they will nevertheless give joyful utterance which rivals that of human tongues."

Hartel[1] 17 changes *uerentes* to *uirentes* ("green or "lively"), which (he says) "ebenso gut auf die Lebhaftigkeit wie die Farbe dieser Meerthiere gehen kann." I see nothing wrong with *uerentes*, "paying their respects" to the poet's friend.

18,70-73 praeteritis cecini patriam genus acta libellis
et *tota sanctum* repetens ab origine dixi
Felicem, donec perfectae tempora uitae
clauderet.

Paulinus on Felix: "In my past poems I have sung of his fatherland, his descent, and his doings, and, tracing him from *the whole of his origin*, I have told of saint Felix right up to the time when he closed his span of life completed."

Tota origo is not a convincing phrase. I would read *totum sancta*, comparing 108 f. *sed* totum *funeris almi/praesentare iuuat quem Nola inpendit honorem*; 21,361 *prima repetens ab origine* cuncta *reuoluam*; Verg. *Georg.* 4,285 f. *altius*

omnem/*expediam prima repetens ab origine famam.* The appropriateness of *sancta* as an epithet of Felix's *origo* becomes clear from 15,50 ff.: his forebears came from an Eastern country (Syria) *quae patriarchas/quaeque pios tulerat, Christi sacra uasa, prophetas.* A similar correction, quite convincing although not adopted by Hartel, at 21,583 *ergo suo totam* (for *suam toto*) *uobis loquar ordine causam* was made by Zechmeister (*WS* 1 [1879] 126 f.).

18,177-179 et manet in mediis quasi gemma intersita tectis,
basilicas per quinque sacri spatiosa sepulchri
atria *diffundens.*

"It [*sc.* Felix's tomb] remains inset like a jewel amongst the buildings, *dividing* the large expanse surrounding the sacred sepulchre between five basilicas" (Walsh). This translates *diffindens*, which should stand in the text; *diffundens* ("spreading out"), the manuscript reading, makes no sense here.

19,166-167 [Nola] caecis mixta ruinis
orbis et ipsa *** moriens in nocte iacebat.

"Nola itself, involved in the blind destruction of the world, lay dying in *** darkness."

In 167 there is a gap in all the manuscripts except E (14th century), which has *iam.* Because *iam* is unmetrical Hartel[1] 66 argues that it is not a conjecture of the scribe of E (who would have made a proper job of it) but preserves a trace of genuine tradition (for other passages in which E has, or may have, done so see Hartel[1] 50); Hartel therefore adopts Chatelain's conjecture <*et*>*iam*, and G. Wiman (*Eranos* 32 [1934] 108) proposes *ima* ("deep"). I do not think that this argument is convincing; Hartel[1] 49 himself admits that many of E's independent readings are no more than conjectures, and a good parallel for the intrusion of *iam* here is the very similar intrusion of *tunc* at 509 below (Hartel[1] 70 f.). Other epithets of *nocte*, such as *alta* (cf. 27 f. above) or *atra*, are at least as probable as *ima.*

19,183-186 o caecis mens digna animis et numina digna
auersis seruire deo! Venus et *nemus* illis
sint deus; ebrietas demens, amor inpius illos
sanctificent.

"O mind worthy of blind souls, and deities worthy of those who shun serving God! Let Venus and *a grove* be a god for them; let mad drunkenness and unholy love hallow them."

Part of a long tirade against people who worship Venus and Bacchus: 169 *prostibulum Veneris simul et dementia Bacchi*; 171 *sociata libido* [= Venus] *furori* [= Bacchus]; 174 *sanguineus furor* [= Bacchus] *atque incesta libido* [= Venus];

178-182 *Veneris sacris . . . furialia sacra* [a reference to Bacchus]; 185 *ebrietas demens, amor inpius*; 204 *Cypris adulteriis, furiis regnare Lyaeus.* When therefore in 184 we see Venus paired with the completely unintelligible *nemus* we can say with confidence that *nemus* conceals a reference to Bacchus. Now in each of the six passages which I have quoted above Bacchus is denoted by or associated with *furor* or *dementia*; so too, I suggest, in 184, where I think that *Furor* is the only metrically possible replacement for *nemus.* Where then has *nemus* come from? From an erroneous repetition of *uenus*, slightly disguised.

Hartel's punctuation at the end of 183 instead of in the middle of 184 is a mistake, as is pointed out by Shackleton Bailey (p. 3).

19,475-476 non igitur quasi fur, *quod erat latro*, sed quasi custos
aufert inlicitam securus praedo rapinam.

"So the robber bore off the forbidden booty untroubled, as though he were a guard and not the thieving brigand that he was" (Walsh). This is certainly the meaning, but it demands that the comma should come not after *latro* but after *erat*; for *fur* used "vice adiectivi" see *ThLL* VI 1608,75 ff.

19,571-573 nam neque uel tacitae furtum committere terrae
ausus erat specubusue cauis de more latronum,
indicium metuens, credendae fraudis auarus.

"For he had not dared to entrust the stolen article either to the silent earth or, after the manner of brigands, to hollow caves, fearing exposure." The last three words do not make satisfactory sense. Repunctuate (as Migne) with no comma after *metuens*: "fearing exposure of the deposit of his dishonest acquisition."

20,77-78 *medium* suis aufert
sinciput.

The sacrificer of a hog cuts off its head (cf. *caput* at 218 below), not "the middle of its half-head" (whatever that may mean) but "both halves of its head." For *medium* read *geminum* (*gem* > *meg* > *med*); the same corruption has occurred in some manuscripts of Stat. *Theb.* 11,114 *gemino de cardine mundi.*

20,86-92 denique mox nec mille uiam permisus abire
passibus elucente die simul aggere plano,
non tenebris pauitante nec offendente salebris,
lapsus equo et quasi fixus humi se tollere rursus . . .
non potuit coepitque pedes clamare ligatos
idque probare iacens plantis quasi conpede *iunctis.*

The comma after *salebris* at the end of 88 should be deleted, since (as Migne realised) *pauitante* and *offendente* should be construed with *equo*: "In the end he was not allowed to go even a mile on his journey. In bright daylight and on a level road he slipped from his horse, which did not take fright at the dark nor stumble over ruts; and, as though pinned to the ground, he could not raise himself up again and began to call out that his feet were pinioned and to prove it by lying as though his feet were joined by a chain." In 92 I suspect that *iunctis* should be *uinctis* (the two words are often indistinguishable in manuscripts); in Paulinus's redundant and repetitive manner *plantis uinctis* is an exact equivalent of *pedes ligatos*, and in 106 below (cf. 172 and 188) we have *uincla pedum*; the two verbs recur in the opposite order at 165 f. *uinxisset . . . ligasset. Compede uinctus* ends a hexameter at Hor. *Epist.* 1,3,3, Tib. 2,6,25, Ov. *Pont.* 1,6,31.

20,99-101 tamquam offendiculi causam cognosceret ultro
aut aliquem prohibere uiam, qua coeperat ire,
uidisset, sic *fugit, iter* cursumque retorsit.

"As though of its own accord it [i.e. the horse] realized the cause of its stumble, or had seen someone blocking the road on which it had started to go, ..." Then the comma after *fugit* should be deleted (Migne is again right): "it shied away from the road and turned back its course."

20,144-145 *o* mihi, qui talem merui desumere poenam
hac in sede miser . . . !

"Alas for me, who have in my wretchedness deserved to incur such a punishment in this place. . . ." Shackleton Bailey (p. 11) notes: "*o mihi* seems to be unique, and *heu mihi* has virtually no warrant (cf. *Thes.* 6.2672.62). Probably we should read *vae mihi*." If *o mihi* is not accepted, the obvious replacement is *ei mihi*, which is as appropriate in this context as it is at 23,201.

21,500-503 at modo cassus opum nec opum sed uerius expers
†damnorum† onerum, secura liber habendi
paupertate fruor, nec habent †imma† sequentum
uincula quo teneant nudum.

"But now, lacking wealth which is not wealth but more truly *** burdens, free from possessing, I enjoy untroubled poverty." In 500 I have deleted the comma which editors print after the first *opum*, since *opum nec* (= *non*) *opum* means "wealth which is not wealth" (cf. 19,454 *non uigiles uigiles*). In 501 *damnorum* has always been emended to *damn<at>orum* ("reprobate" Walsh), but *damn<os>orum* ("disastrous"), a word used at 25,54, would be

much superior both palaeographically and in point of sense; the poet has in mind what Hilarius in his comment on Matth. 10,26 calls *damnosum animae lucrum* ("pelf which destroys the soul").

The crux at the end of 502 is not so easy to deal with. The traditional emendation of *imma* is *inimica*. Accepting this, Walsh translates "the hostile bonds of posterity," interpreting this with reference to the need to provide for one's descendants, whereas Wiman (*Eranos* 32 [1934] 121 ff.) explains the phrase as an instance of enallage, equivalent to *inimicorum sequentium uincula*, "de förföljande fiendernas bojor." I think that the sense we require is "nor do the shackles that bind those who seek [? worldly goods] have any grip on the man who is destitute"; for material possesions acting as shackles see 547 f. below, 24,907 f., 33,9 ff. A word like *mundana* (cf. *mundi* at 505 and 520) or *terrena* (cf. 509) would give the sense, but I have not been able to think of anything that is palaeographically satisfactory.

25,23-26 seque alium ex sese sociali in corpore cernens
ipse propheta *sui* mox fuit ore *nouo*:
"haec" inquit "caro carne mea est, os ab ossibus istud
nosco meis, haec est costa mei lateris."

Adam speaks of the newly created Eve: "And, seeing his other self [*se alium* = *se alterum*], sprung from himself, in a partner's body, he was then a prophet of himself with novel voice: 'This flesh' he said 'is flesh of my flesh, I recognize that as bone of my bones, this is a rib of my side.'"

In 24 both *sui* and *nouo* are inappropriate: in the following couplet he speaks not of himself (*sui*) but of Eve, and it was not his voice but Eve that was "new." So for *nouo* read *noui* (which has been assimilated to *ore*); *sui noui* = "his new creature" (for Paulinus's use of the neuter see Hartel's Index, p. 438).

25,137-140 sed *cedo, ut* insani deceant regalia flatus
pectora, quae nobis cum Pharaone *manus*?
dissidet a nostris caua mundi gloria regnis,
nec coit aduersis lux pia cum tenebris.

"But I grant that mad pride befits the heart of kings; what [*manus*] have we (Christians) with Pharaoh? The hollow glory of the world differs from our kingdom, and holy light does not combine with opposing darkness."

If *cedo* is the word which means "I grant" the line is unmetrical since it has a long *e*; to restore metre Shackleton Bailey (p. 15) would omit *ut*. I should keep the text, taking *cedo* (with a short *e*) as "tell me," looking forward to the question in the next line; the intervening *ut* clause is causal (causal *ut* is frequently construed with the subjunctive in late Latin).

Shackleton Bailey finds *manus* "dark" and tentatively suggests *salus*, but this is palaeographically improbable and does not fit the following couplet, which spells out the incompatibility of Christianity with "the hollow glory of the world." The general sense must be "what connexion have we with Pharaoh?" (Walsh). It seems unlikely that this sense could be obtained from any other feminine noun which might be substituted for *manus*, and perhaps we should be content with taking *manus* as the hand of friendship and companionship ("*societas, communio*," *ThLL* VIII 359,16). That Paulinus might have used it thus is suggested by 27,345-348 *nunc age, sancte parens, aurem mihi dede manumque;/nodemus socias in uincula mutua palmas/inque uicem nexis alterno foedere dextris/sermones uarios gressu spatiante seramus* ("Come now, holy father, and offer me your ear and hand. Let us clasp hands to bind ourselves in comradeship to each other, and when our hands are entwined in this interchange of friendship we can converse on various matters as we stroll around" Walsh).

25,163-164 sponsa uiro tantum non est subiecta marito,
et genetrix partu nec mulier coitu.

Of the immaculate conception.

Hartel unwisely omits the comma which Migne prints after *tantum*, and which shows the meaning to be that Mary was "merely betrothed to a man [Joseph], and did not submit to a husband; a mother in giving birth but not a woman in intercourse." Hartel queries *et*, suggesting *est* instead, but *et . . . nec* (= *et non*) correspond.

27,320-322 sed reprimam tumidos flatus nec magna super me
exiguus spirabo loqui referarque *relicta*
paruus humo et plano modici pede carminis ibo.

"But I shall check my swelling airs nor, feeble as I am, shall I aspire to lofty utterance above my powers, but, having left the ground, I shall return insignificant and walk with foot on the level ground of modest song."

The poet checks his high poetic flight and returns to the ground. Instead of the ablative absolute *relicta . . . humo* we surely require the dative *relictae . . . humo*, construed with *referar*.

31,607-612 quem Conplutensi mandauimus urbe propinquis
coniunctum tumuli foedere martyribus,
ut de uicino sanctorum sanguine ducat
quo nostras illo spargat in igne animas.
forte etenim nobis quoque peccatoribus olim
sanguinis haec *nostri* guttula lumen erit.

"[The child] which we buried in the city of Complutum joined in the bond of the tomb with the martyrs nearby, so that he can draw from the neighbouring blood of the saints some with which to sprinkle our souls in that fire (of hell). For perhaps even for us sinners this drop of blood will one day be a source of light."

Shackleton Bailey (p. 18) points out the difficulty of *nostri*; if it is sound, *haec guttula nostri sanguinis* must mean the child of Paulinus which had died a week after it was born and had been buried at Complutum close by the tomb of saints; but without *nostri* the blood in question would undoubtedly be that just mentioned in 609 (the blood of the saints). This suggests that *nostri* may be a corruption of another adjective which identified the blood as that of the saints. One possibility might be *uiui* ("living" blood), which could have been mistaken for an abbreviation of *nostri*, especially with *nostras* preceding in 610.

32,92-93 sic *artior* ipse sacerdos
femineos uitat coitus patiturque uiriles.

The homosexual practices of the worshippers of Cybele: "So more . . . the priest himself avoids intercourse with women and endures it with men."

For the "meaningless" *artior* Shackleton Bailey (p. 19) tentatively suggests *fractior*, "more effeminate (than the rest)." I have little doubt that the true reading is *taetrior* ("more foul"), not an uncommon word in Paulinus; the first letter has been lost by haplography after the last letter of *sic*.

32,111 quae nox est animi, *quae* sunt inprouida corda!

Paulinus is attacking pagan Roman rituals: "What darkness of the mind! what unforseeing hearts!"

I suspect that the second *quae* is an erroneous repetition of the first and should be exclamatory *quam*.

38 Woodburn Gardens, *Aberdeen* AB15 8JA

PRISCILLIAN AND NICOLAITISM

BY

ALBERTO FERREIRO

Priscillian was censured of both doctrinal heresy and sexual immorality by his accusers. On the question of his alleged sexual exploits, this issue merits a closer look than has been previously done by modern researchers. Some scholars believe the conciliar decrees of the Iberian Peninsula regarding relations between men and women are a response, directly and indirectly, to illicit relations in Priscillianist circles.[1] It is further argued that these decrees reflect an episcopal attempt to bring women into greater submission to men within and outside of Priscillianist groups.[2] There has been, moreover, some discord among some researchers as to whether Priscillian was ever accused of Nicolaitism.[3] There are, however, other pressing questions that I will explore in this article that will shed light on these concerns in Priscillian scholarship. Specifically, my agenda is: (a) to identify precisely in the anti-Priscillian literature which writers were responsible for accusing Priscillian and his followers of sexual immorality; (b) In the same vein, to engage any evidence which identifies whether Nicolaitism was ever attributed to Priscillianists; and (c), Lastly, to distinguish between rumor based misinformation about sexual libertarianism as opposed to what was actually decreed officially in conciliar legislation.

---

[1] V. Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy.* University of California Press, 1995. For the councils I am using J. Vives (*et al.*). *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos.* Barcelona-Madrid, 1963. [Hereafter Vives, *CV*]. See also the important commentary of the councils by J. Orlandis and Domingo Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios de la España Romana y Visigoda.* Pamplona, 1986, pp. 65-100 and 137-150. For an overview with novel insights see, Raymond Van Dam, *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul.* University of California Press, 1985, pp. 88-114.

[2] Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, pp. 109-114.

[3] H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila. The occult and the charismatic in the Early Church.* Oxford, 1976, p. 168, believes that Bachiarius was rejecting a charge of Nicolaitism in his rebuff of Priscillianism. Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, p. 58 and p. 193, note 62, does not seem to agree.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

A fundamental matter that needs to be addressed is whether sexual immorality and Nicolaitism were already identified as a *topos* in the fourth century. It was most certainly already in development in the first century and in the ensuing medieval centuries; but reading sources forward or backward to the fourth century runs the hazard of anachronism. The one source at the latter stages of the Priscillianist controversy, one dating after his execution, is Jerome's *Letter* 133 to Ctesiphon (dated 415) wherein he associated Priscillianists with Nicolaitism through typological figuration.[4] Was Jerome, however, creating for the first time this connection or was he reaffirming and perpetuating more specifically by way of a *topos* an already pervasive rumor about Priscillianist sexual immorality?

The affinity of Nicolaitism with sexual immorality precedes Jerome and it originated more precisely with Irenaeus of Lyons and Clement of Alexandria.[5] Both Greek Fathers agreed that the sect of the Nicolaitans, which did flourish in their time, was directly founded by the New Testament Nicolas of Antioch (*Acts* 6:5-6 and *Revelation* 2:6 and 14-15). While Irenaeus accused the Nicolaitans of immorality in imitation of their founder, Clement denounced them of discrediting the reputation of Nicolas who would never have condoned their behavior.[6] Disagreements aside, Irenaeus and Clement provide evidence that Nicolaitism was already a *topos* associated primarily with sexual depravity. Following the opinions of Irenaeus, subsequent Church Fathers such as Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Epiphanius of Salamis elaborated negatively upon an already tarnished image of Nicolas of Antioch.[7] Hippolytus, relying heavily on Irenaeus, further accused Nicolas of spiritually engendering a variety of Gnostic groups.[8]

---

[4] See Ferreiro, "Jerome's polemic against Priscillian in his *Letter* to Ctesiphon (133,4)." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 39,2 (1993) 309-332.

[5] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1, 26.3. in *Contre les hérésies*. Livre 1.2, (eds.) A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau. Sources chrétiennes (= SC), 264. Paris, 1979, pp. 348-349. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata III*, Cap. IV. *Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*. 2 Band. (ed.) O. Stählin, Leipzig, 1906, I, pp. 207-208.

[6] See the discussion by K.A. Fox, "The Nicolaitans, Nicolaus and the early Church," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 23,4 (1994) 485-496, at 490-493. For a full inventory of patristic sources on Nicolaitism see, É. Amann, "Nicolaites," *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* 11,1 (1931) cols. 499-506.

[7] Theodoret, *Haer. Fab. Comp* 3.1, *PG* 83:402. Epiphanius, *Panarion* 25, in F. Williams (trans.) *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Leiden, 1987, pp. 77-82. See the discussion in Fox, "Nicolaitans," pp. 491-492.

[8] Hippolytus, *Refutation of all Heresies* (*Philosophumena*) 7.36, *in Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*. 3 Band. (ed.) P. Wendland. Leipzig, 1916, pp. 222-223. See also Fox, "Nicolaitans," pp. 494-495.

Fundamentally important in these discussions was the practice by post-apostolic Catholics and Gnostics to establish the apostolic legitimacy of their respective communities of faith. K.A. Fox makes a valid observation that Gnostics sought to validate their teachings, mainly to counter Catholic attacks, by identifying their founder as an apostle or someone closely associated with them.[9] Likewise, I am in full agreement that it is indeed very doubtful that the Nicolaitans were "Gnostics" already in the first century, contrary to the claims of Irenaeus and Clement.[10] Moreover, when considering the late second century and beyond, it is rather certain that Nicolaitism did not any longer exist as an actual organized sect. By the time Irenaeus's generation was writing the *topos* of Nicolaitism was already developed enough to be harnessed to condemn individuals or groups for alleged sexual immorality. At what precise year or decade did the sect of the Nicolaitans dissolve we can not ascertain.

In the western Mediterranean, fourth century Priscillianists became the target of Nicolaitan accusations, as testified in both Catholic and Priscillianist sources. These documents which we will now engage I have organized for this study into two main groups. The first, are those where Nicolaitans are explicitly mentioned; while the second constitutes texts which speak of sexual immorality without any specific typological intent. I have also made one additional distinction in these two main groups; those written within the Iberian Peninsula and those of external provenance.

The only clear mention of Nicolaitism interestingly comes from writers closest to the Priscillianists. The first is Bachiarius who in *De Fide*, which he wrote to clear himself of any heretical suspicion, voiced his own rejection of Nicolaitism: *Nicolao diacono in haeresim declinante, gloriosa collectorum fratrum in virtutibus Dei opera refulserunt.*[11] It is safe to infer that Bachiarius was responding to an explicit charge of sexual immorality associated with the Priscillianists, but one based more on oral transmission (rumor and gossip) and not reflecting any conciliar condemnation, as I will demonstrate below. The phrase *Nicolao diacono in haeresim declinante* echoes the Irenaean tradition that Nicolas the deacon fell into apostasy and sexual immorality after the apostles had consecrated him at Jerusalem. Whatever doctrinal teachings the Nicolaitans had initially were subsequently set aside by fourth century polemicists, once a sect ceased to exist. As a consequence, the alleged sexual immorality of Nicolaitans became the single focus of the

[9] Fox, "Nicolaitans," pp. 493-494.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 495-496.

[11] Bachiarius, *De Fide, PL* 20:1020-1021. See Chadwick, *Priscillian*, p. 168.

emerging *topos*. Typological parallels were made of Priscillian of Avila: he had at one time been appointed a bishop in succession of the apostles, he apostatized and fell into doctrinal and moral error, as had done Nicolas. This tradition of Priscillian is most clearly expressed in the *Chronica* of Sulpicius Severus, although he never outright called Priscillian a Nicolaitan. We shall turn to this text below.[12]

In this brief reference, then, Bachiarius does indeed lend credence that at the very least rumors circulated about Priscillian's alleged immorality. He still, nevertheless, did not elaborate in *De Fide* upon the matter nor did he seize the opportunity to label the Priscillianists as Nicolaitans.

There are two important Nicolaitan passages in the *Tractates* of Priscillian [or written by his followers] which reveal their own need to address and refute this association. The first text reads:

> Anathema autem sit doctrina Nicholaitarum partemque cum Sodoma habeat et Gomora quisque odibilia deo sacrilegia aut instituit aut sequitur.[13]

The imagery of Sodom and Gomorrah effectively brings to the surface every form of sexual deviancy. The second passage issues a second refutation:

> Anathema sit qui Nicolaitarum fornicationes et multimoda ostenda in scribturis cum discipulis et doctoribus suis daemonia non damnat uel qui eorum opera sectantur.[14]

Here the authors denounce those who do not condemn the false teachings and lack of morals of the Nicolaitans. As if that were not enough their immorality is also presented as being inspired by demons.

The apparent rumors about sexual depravity among Priscillianists compelled the authors of the *Tractates* to distance themselves unequivocally and they did so by expressing an absolute clear refutation of Nicolaitism. As in the case of Bachiarius, the authors of the *Tractates* utilized Nicolaitism as a *topos* in their favor to denounce the evident charge of moral depravity, especially through the Sodom and Gomorrah image and its alleged demonic inspiration. What is also revealing about these two passages is their lack of extended commentary. This becomes more so evident when

---

[12] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* chaps. 47, 48, and 50, *CSEL*, 1, Vindobonae, 1866, pp. 100-103. See also the translation in Schaff and Wace, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 11. Eerdmans, 1894, pp. 119-122.

[13] Priscillian, *Tractatus* I, 6, 23-26. *CSEL*, 18. Vindobonae, 1889, p. 7. Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, p. 95 note 33 on Priscillian's refutation of heresy.

[14] *Ibid.*, *Tractatus* I, 27, 4-7, p. 23.

set against the larger concerns of the *Tractates*. Priscillian and his collaborators devoted far more ink to answer the weightier accusation of being Gnostics and Manichaeans, among other matters. When it comes to sexual deviancy, one gets the impression from the *Tractates* that the issue, although not one that could be ignored altogether, certainly did not figure as a top priority item in response to the Catholic bishops who opposed them.

Here I would like to raise the question, which I will now discuss, as to what extent the Catholic bishops focused their polemic on alleged deviant sex among the Priscillianists. The most forceful reprimands of Priscillian were publicly issued in conciliar decrees at several provincial councils convened in the Iberian Peninsula throughout this rather lengthy ordeal. It is imperative to ascertain how many of the conciliar decrees address the sexual depravity of Priscillianists, and if the bishops gathered in council ever outright accused them of Nicolaitism.

The first provincial gathering of bishops that concerns itself with practices which may have addressed Priscillianists is the Council of Zaragoza (380) which has attracted modern scholarly scrutiny.[15] The bishops, however, gathered at Zaragoza do not mention Priscillian or his followers by name, at least in the version of the *Acta* which has come down to us. Priscillianists, undoubtedly, were included generally speaking in the warnings which the council issued to address the wider Catholic community of faith. The council, however, was not a meeting held to deal first and foremost with Priscillianism. All of this changed, of course, in the next two decades with the proliferation of Priscillianism in greater Hispania, Gaul, and Lusitania. What exactly, then, do the canons of the Council of Zaragoza engage that would have any bearing directly or indirectly on the alleged sexual deviancy of Priscillianists?

Canon 1 of the Council of Zaragoza stipulates that women should not be allowed to meet with men who have no direct family ties. Most scholars agree the prohibition is a broad correction of ascetic groups which were found in both Catholic circles and those on the edges of orthodoxy, such as Priscillianists.[16] Canon 8 has been the source of even greater disagreement

---

[15] See the published proceedings on the Council of Zaragoza in *I Concilio Caesaraugustano, MDC Aniversario*. Zaragoza, 1981. See the related discussions in, Chadwick, *Priscillian*, pp. 211-212; Orlandis – Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, pp. 68-80. For the text see, Vives, *CV*, pp. 16-18. Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, pp. 25-46 and Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, p. 88 note 2 on the precarious nature of the council as a source for understanding Priscillianism.

[16] Ut mulieres omnes ecclesiae catholicae et fideles a virorum alienorum lectione et

among scholars on the question whether the bishops had the Priscillianists in mind. In any case, even if this canon was intended to single out Priscillianists, it still does not in any strong way castigate immoral behavior.[17] What is striking about this council is the absence of any reference whatsoever to Priscillian's alleged sexual immorality.

At the First Council of Toledo (400), even more surprisingly so, which convened in the midst of the apogee of Priscillianism, hardly at all addressed concerns over illicit relationships between women and men. Canon 16, dealing mainly with a Gnostic agenda, accused Priscillianists of rejecting marriage on the grounds that it encourages procreation.[18] It also prohibits the Priscillianist practice of the segregated coming together of men and women in private homes. Incidentally, Augustine and Filastrius of Brescia recall and condemn the Priscillianist practice of separating spouses upon entry into the movement. Consentius's *Letters* to Augustine focus their critique of Priscillian primarily to magic.[19] These latter writers simply restated and depended upon the conciliar decrees adding nothing new, and they were not speaking from direct experience.

The separation of spouses, understandably, lent itself to rumors of immorality, even though this was also a common practice among emerging Catholic ascetical groups. Since by the latter fourth century Priscillian had

---

coetibus separentur, vel ad ipsas legentes aliae studio vel docendi vel discendi conveniant, quoniam hoc Apostolus iubet. Ab universis episcopis dictum est: Anathema futuros qui hanc concilii sententiam non observaverint. Vives, *CV*, p. 16. F. Rodriguez, "Concilio I de Zaragoza. Texto crítico," *Concilio Caesaraugustano*, pp. 9-25. See also, Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, on Canon 1, pp. 72-73. A dissenting view is in Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, p. 43, also at 33-35 on Canon 1.

[17] Item lectum est: Non velandas esse virgines, quae se Deo voverint, nisi quadraginta annorum probata aetate, quam sacerdos conprobaverit. Ab universis episcopis dictum est: Placet, Vives, *CV*, p. 18. See Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, pp. 40-42. Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, p. 74. M. Sotomayor, "Sobre el canon *VIII* del Concilio de Zaragoza del 380," *Concilio Caesaraugustano*, pp. 255-271.

[18] Si quis dixerit vel crediderit coniugia hominum, quae secundum legem divinam licita habentur, execrabilia esse, anathema sit, Vives, *CV*, p. 28. Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, p. 114. Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, pp. 109-111.

[19] Augustine, *De haeresibus*, 5 and 70, *CCSL*, 46. Turnholti, 1979, pp. 333-334. See the commentary by L.G. Müller, *The "De Haeresibus" of Saint Augustine* (ed. & trans.) Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, 90. CUA Press, 1956, pp. 64-67 and 110-113. Filastrius, *Diversarum Hereseon Liber*, 33 and 84, *CCSL*, 9. Turnholti, 1957, pp. 231-232 and 253-254. See Chadwick, *Priscillian*, p. 212. For Consentius see Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, pp. 111-112, *Ibid.*, "'Sheep in Wolves' Clothing': the Letters of Consentius to Augustine," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986) 515-535.

been blacklisted a heretic everything he did or said was interpreted in the worst possible light. Consistent with the conciliar decrees, Augustine and Filastrius did not avail themselves of the opportunity in their heresiological works to expound upon any alleged sexual deviancy. Telling, however, is the absence of a litany of charges by the bishops of adultery, fornication, homosexuality, bestiality, and orgies at this council which otherwise devoted significant attention to Priscillian's teachings.

The First Council of Braga (561) in Canon 11 reissued the same censure of Canon 16 of Toledo I, but couched within an anti-Manichaean rebuke.[20] Canon 12 of Braga I denounced Priscillian for teaching that the human body and fetus were the marks of the devil and demons. That this alleged teaching contained a disturbing deviation from Catholic doctrine regarding Christ's human birth through Mary and his own bodily resurrection is reflected in the anathema of Canon 10 in Toledo I.[21] Canon 15 revisited the problem raised at Zaragoza in Canon 1, one that was reaffirmed in several subsequent Iberian councils.[22] At Braga I, however, the bishops condemned the novel practice of "adopting" women by men which the Priscillianists had developed to fulfill the earlier requirement of women having family ties to the men at their gatherings. In view of this activity, if indeed it was correctly understood by the bishops, it is rather easy to comprehend why rumors about immoral behavior continued to circulate and became a part of the opposition.[23] Having said all of this, no conciliar decree at Zaragoza, Toledo I, and Braga I condemns explicitly the morality of the Priscillianists nor does Nicolaitism surface even as a *topos*. The conciliar canons of Braga I reveal the major focus to be upon doctrinal errors wherein Priscillian is labeled a Gnostic, Manichaean, Sabellian, and more besides. On the fluid use of such labels Van Dam astutely notes

---

[20] Si quis coniugia humana damnat er procreationem nascentium perhorrescit, sicut Manicheus et Priscillianus dixerunt, anathema sit, Vives, *CV*, p. 68, Chadwick, *Priscillian*, p. 225. Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, p. 143.

[21] Si quis plasmationem humani corporis diaboli dicit esse figmentum et conceptiones in uteris matrum operibus dicit daemonum figurari propter quod et resurrectionem carnis non credit, sicut Manicheus et Priscillianus dixerunt, anathema sit, Vives, *CV*, p. 68. Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, p. 143.

[22] Si quis clericorum vel monachorum praeter matrem aut germanam vel thiam vel quae proxima sibi consanguinitate iunguntur alias aliquas quasi adobtivas faeminas secum retinent et cum ipsis cohabitant, sicut Priscilliani secta docuit, anathema sit, Vives, *CV*, p. 69. For the conciliar references see, Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, p. 143, note 32.

[23] See Chadwick, *Priscillian*, pp. 225-226.

that, "Yet a fundamental ambiguity was also a part of this inheritance, not the least because, as we saw with accusations of Manichaeism, accusations of Priscillianism could be applied rather indiscriminately."[24]

Of the literary sources originating from the Iberian Peninsula only Apringius of Beja, a contemporary of Priscillian, Turibius of Artorga, who wrote a letter to Pope Leo I requesting his views about Priscillian, and Isidore of Seville, who flourished long after the movement had dissipated, occupied themselves respectively with Nicolaitism, moral issues, and Priscillianism.

Apringius of Beja in two places of his *Commentatio in Apocalypsin* identified the Nicolaitans and condemns them predictably as heretics. Nowhere, however, did he associate the sect, even as a *topos*, with the Priscillianists nor any other specific heretical group.[25] We do not possess the actual letter of Turribius of Astorga to Pope Leo I, but the lengthy reply by the pope allows us to reconstruct what the bishop of Astorga inquired about. Only three of the Pope's comments condemn Priscillian's teaching against marriage and procreation in the Introduction; cap. VII, and cap. XVI.[26] The pope, furthermore, endorsing the Peninsular conciliar decrees added that these doctrines gave the Priscillianists a license to lewdness.[27] He then made the interesting observation that the "widely published" reports about their immorality made them like the Manichaeans.[28] If the pope's comments are a reflection of the level of concern by Turibius on this matter they reveal a low priority of preoccupation. That is, within the framework of the pope's lengthy letter, the morality of Priscillian was hardly touched upon, not even meriting an invocation of Nicolaitism.

Before dealing with Isidore of Seville, Pope Leo's reference to the "widely published" reports regarding immorality deserves closer inspection. Who or what, then, is the principal source of information spreading the belief about

---

[24] Not a single specific heresy is mentioned in the *Acta* of the Council of Zaragoza or Toledo I. At Braga I a variety of labels surface in the canons against Priscillian: Gnostic (canon 2, p. 67) Sabellian (canon 1, p. 67) Paul of Samosata and Photinus (canon 3, p. 67) Cerdon and Marcion (canon 4, pp. 67-68) and Manichaean (canons 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, and 14, pp. 67-69). Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, p. 110.

[25] See the new edition by A. del Campo Hernández, *Comentario al Apocalipsis de Apringio de Beja.* Institución San Jeronimo, 25. Estella (Navarra): Editorial Verbo Divino, 1991.

[26] Pope Leo I, *Epistola 15, PL* 54, cols. 678-695. See Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, pp. 113-114 where he expresses serious reservations about the accuracy of the pope's description of Priscillianism.

[27] *Ep.* 15, 7, *PL* 54, cols. 683-684.

[28] *Ep.* 15, 16, *PL* 54, col. 689.

promiscuous Priscillianists? To answer this question we need to examine writers external to the Iberian Peninsula who wrote against Priscillian, namely Sulpicius Severus and Jerome.

In light of what I have already established earlier in this paper the pope can not be referring to any known published tracts or conciliar decrees from the Iberian Peninsula. He may be very likely identifying here the ubiquitous word of mouth misinformation that circulated in corollary fashion with the more concrete written denunciations. There is also the possibility the word of mouth, insinuated or otherwise, information reached the pope in more tangible fashion through the pen of Sulpicius Severus, who in his *Chronica* explicitly elaborated Priscillian's doubtful morality.

Sulpicius Severus is without question the only source that we posses which details some of Priscillian's alleged moral lapses.[29] His portrait of Priscillian gathers in one place the repeated accusations of Gnosticism and Manichaeanism. Central to our concerns he also put into writing in the *Chronica* the oral based rumors of Priscillian's sexual exploits.[30] The *Chronica*, then, may well indeed be the source which Pope Leo had access to and refers to in *Letter* 15. There is also the very likely possibility that his "widely published" comment refers not to any written work, but rather to the oral tradition I have already identified. Lastly, in view of his comments, the fact that the *topos* of Nicolaitism never appears in the *Chronica* should not be of concern. It was hardly necessary for Sulpicius to invoke the *topos* to get his point across.

In 415 Jerome wrote his *Letter* (133) to a Ctesiphon in order to warn him about the Pelagians, but in the process he also created an imaginative typological diatribe against Priscillian. In a detailed study of a section of this letter (133, 4), which I carried out recently, I identified a heresiarchical typological list intended by Jerome to connect Priscillian with

---

[29] *Chronica*, II, caps. 48 and 50, pp. 101 and 103.

[30] Instantius et Saluianus damnati iudicio sacerdotum Priscillianum etiam laicum, sed principem malorum omnium, una secum Caesaraugustana synodo notatum ad confirmandas vires suas episcopum in Abilensi oppido constituunt (chap. 47).

Inde iter coeptum ingressi, turpi sane pudibundoque comitatu, cum uxoribus atque alienis etiam feminis, in quis erat Euchrotia ac filia eius Procula, de qua fuit in sermone hominum Priscilliani stupro grauidam partum sibi graminibus abegisse (chap. 48).

Is Priscillianum gemino iudicio auditum conuictumque maleficii nec diffitentem obscenis se studuisse doctrinis, nocturnos etiam turpium feminarum egisse conuentus nudumque orare solitum, nocentem pronuntiauit redegitgue in custodiam, donec ad principem referret (chap. 50), *Chron.* II, cap. 47, 5-7, p. 100; cap. 48, 16-20, p. 101; cap. 50, 25-29, p. 103.

Simon Magus and his "successors."[31] Among these successors which Jerome associated with Priscillian through typology is Nicolas of Antioch. What is even more fascinating is Jerome's creation with the list of male heretics a parallel list of women heretics. Nicolas of Antioch is aligned by Jerome with "bands of women" which carries with it the images of orgies, adultery, fornication and related sexual practices.[32] The overall purpose of the list is to present Priscillian and his followers as embodying the errors, doctrinal and moral, of all previous heretics. Put another way, Priscillianists are Nicolaitans because they too indulge in sexual depravity. Aside from Bachiarius and Priscillian this is our only source which intimates Priscillian directly with Nicolaitism.

It is prudent to ask: How reliable are Sulpicius and Jerome in their reports about Priscillian? I concur with the consensus that neither Sulpicius or Jerome had any substantial or accurate, direct understanding of Priscillian and his doctrines.[33] Moreover, both writers were geographically distant from the Iberian Peninsula and therefore relied entirely upon what reached them about Priscillian through the grapevine, as it were. I am not ready to dismiss Sulpicius and Jerome as entirely useless for the study of Priscillian, however. I do firmly believe that on the issue of sexual immorality both writers relied heavily, even more so Jerome, upon the subcurrent of orally transmitted rumors and gossip. Recalling also that by the fourth century the *topos* of Nicolaitism (sexual deviancy) was quickly becoming a standard label attached to individual heretics and groups.

Isidore of Seville stands at the other end of the controversy. Priscillian's execution was in the distant past, and an organized sect of Priscillianists did not exist. Priscillian, however, did enter the dubious lists of heretics which circulated in the church to warn Christians about past and present doctrinal and moral error. Isidore recalls Priscillian in *De viris illustribus* where he states that his doctrines were inspired by both a Gnostic named Marcus of Memphis and Manes.[34] In *Etymologiarum, De haeresibus Christianorum,*

---

[31] Ferreiro, "Jerome's polemic," at pp. 316-319.

[32] The list in Jerome's letter when extracted is in part the following:
Simon Magus/Helena = a sect.
Nicolas of Antioch = Bands of Women, uncleanness, and so on, in Ferreiro, "Jerome's polemic," p. 313.

[33] Orlandis and Ramos-Lissón, *Historia de los Concilios*, p. 71, and Ferreiro, "Jerome's polemic," pp. 309-332. Van Dam, *Leadership and Community*, p. 106.

[34] Itacius Hispaniarum episcopus, cognomento et eloquio Clarus, scripsit quemdam librum sub apologetici specie, in quo detestanda Priscilliani dogmata et maleficiorum

VIII, 5, 54, he again states that Gnosticism and Manichaeanism inspired Priscillian's doctrines.[35] Congruent with the majority of the sources that we have considered up to now, Isidore of Seville also is silent about the sexual promiscuity nor is there any invocation of Nicolaitans in his works. Isidore reflects already in the seventh century what will be the standard portrait of the "memory" of Priscillianism and it is one focused exclusively with doctrinal error—i.e. Gnostic and Manichaean—and not sexual immorality.[36]

That Priscillian and his followers were suspected of engaging in sexual promiscuity by their opponents there is absolutely no doubt. The testimony of Bachiarius and the Priscillian *Tractates* reveal that both for different reasons felt compelled to denounce Nicolaitism, a *topos* already present in anti-heretical literature associated with sexual depravity. The relative little importance of alleged sexual immorality is patently clear in conciliar decrees, peninsular writers, and by major polemicists like Pope Leo I external to Iberia. We need to read with serious reservations what Sulpicius Severus and Jerome tell us about this aspect of Priscillianism. The major consistent object of attention by all of Priscillian's opponents is his alleged Gnosticism and Manichaeanism. As the centuries subsequent to Priscillian unfolded the *topos* of Nicolaitism was frequently utilized by the Catholic community to condemn the alleged immorality oftentimes associated with heretics. Much later in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the *topos* of Nicolaitism was used by Christian writers to attack Islam and within the Church to ban clerical marriage.[37]

Seattle Pacific University

---

eius artes libidinumque eius probra demonstrat: ostendens, Marcum quemdam Menpheticum, magiae scientissimum, discipulum fuisse Manis et Priscilliani magistrum, II, 1-6, in C. Codoñer Merino, *El "De viris illustribus" de Isidoro de Sevilla.* Estudio y edición crítica. Salamanca, 1964, p. 135.

[35] Priscillianistae a Priscilliano vocati, qui in Hispania ex errore Gnosticorum et Manichaeorum permixtum dogma conposuit, in J. Oroz Reta (*et al.*). *San Isidoro de Sevilla, Etimologías I (Libros I-X).* Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 433. Madrid, 1982, pp. 698-701.

[36] Nicolaitae dicti a Nicolao, diacono Ecclesiae Hierosolymorum, qui cum Stephano et ceteris constitutus est a Petro; qui propter pulchritudinem relinquens uxorem, ut qui vellet eam uteretur, versa est in stuprum talis consuetudo, ut invicem coniugia commutarentur. Quos Iohannes in *Apocalypsi* inprobat dicens (2, 6): "sed hoc habes, quod odisti facta Nicolaitarum," *Ibid.*, VIII, 5, 5; pp. 693-695.

[37] I am currently working on a study of Nicolaitism in Christian texts against Islam in the Middle Ages. For the memory of Priscillian in the Middle Ages see for now J. Orlandis, "Toletanae Illusionis Superstitio," *Scripta Theologica* 18, 1 (1986) 197-213, at 202-204.

STOIC AND ARISTOTELIAN NOTIONS OF SUBSTANCE IN BASIL OF CAESAREA

BY

DAVID G. ROBERTSON

It has long been recognized that the Cappadocian Fathers, and particularly Gregory of Nyssa and his older brother Basil of Caesarea, draw upon the philosophical store available to them in significant ways throughout their works. The research done over the course of this century has made significant advances towards an understanding of what they read as well as how they appropriated the books of the philosophers. In particular, the presence of the logic and physics of the Stoa in their thought has borne the weight of sustained scrutiny well; it is clear that Stoic thought permeates their cosmology as much as it undergirds and shapes their theological polemics. By contrast, a broad contribution stemming from Neoplatonism has proved very difficult to demonstrate, due to the continued influence of older Platonists who were also read by previous generations of theologians of the first rank such as Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius.

The scholar's task would be far easier, and simpler, if more Stoic works had survived from Antiquity, but none from the Old Stoa did, and thus even the Christian authors (who exhibit exceptional philosophical learning) furnish important bits of evidence. Of this fact, Origen's excellent knowledge of Stoic logic is the prime example, even to the point that some information on this score has been transmitted exclusively from his pen. In addition, although Basil contributes far less than Origen in this regard, the latest edition of fragments of Stoic logic by Karlheinz Hülser includes one fragment excerpted from the ninth homily of Basil's *Hexaemeron*.[1] Here Basil makes use of the "dog syllogism" of Chrysippus, an example of the repeated application of his fifth disjunctive undemonstrable argument (also present in the *ad Ablabium* of Gregory of Nyssa).[2] These facts result in a situation

[1] FDS 1158. *Die Fragmente zur Dialektik der Stoiker*, 4 Bande, hrsg. Karlheinz Hülser (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1987-1988).

[2] Examined by R.G. Tanner, 580-581 of "Stoic Influence on the Logic of St. Gregory

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

which both indicates that Stoic elements play a central role in Cappadocian thought while largely denying access to all original and most mediating texts. Since somewhat less attention has been thus far devoted to Stoicism in Basil than in Gregory, there is a need for an examination of Basil's thought which distinguishes him from Gregory of Nyssa *and* balances the input from Stoic logic with Aristotelian elements mediated by later philosophical sources.

The most important work done on this score is undoubtedly that of Reinhard Hübner, who takes a fairly close look at Stoic logic in Basil's trinitarian thought in an article presented as a contribution to a festschrift for the great French patristic scholar Jean Daniélou.[3] After its publication, the consensus of scholarly opinion has decisively shifted in favor of Gregory of Nyssa as author of the 38th letter in the Basilian corpus; that is, in the main its arguments have won the day.[4] Thus, any serious consideration of Stoicism (or for that matter Neoplatonism or Aristotelianism) in Basil must start with a reappraisal of Hübner's seminal study; first, its conclusions must be critically examined in order to determine how well it does justice to the development of Basil's theology, and second, the evidence for Stoic philosophy must be probed a bit further, taking into account recent scholarly advances as well as a more comprehensive range of documents.

In point of fact, although other arguments are presented, much of Hübner's case rests on the tendency in Basil's letters and treatises to favor Stoic as opposed to Aristotelian logic in his conception of οὐσία, or (as the case may be) a general similitude to Stoicism coupled with definite rejection of Aristotelian aspects of classification and predication. Yet Hübner himself must qualify his conclusions at nearly every major point, for instance in his concession that "Basilius ist kein Systematiker, und die Verwendung stoischer Vorstellungen bei einem begrenzten Problem der Trinitätstheologie hat ihn nicht daran gehindert, sich bei einem anderen aristotelischer

---

of Nyssa," *Studia Patristica* 18.3 (1989): 557-581. This argument is discussed by Benson Mates, *Stoic Logic* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961), 79-80.

[3] Reinhard Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der Sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilius," *Epektasis*, eds. Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 463-490.

[4] The ascription of the letter to Gregory of Nyssa is upheld by Paul J. Fedwick, "A Commentary of Gregory of Nyssa or the 38th Letter of Basil of Caesarea," *OCP* 44 (1978): 31-51. The authorship debate is reviewed by Marcella Forlin Patrucco, 407-408 of her edition of the first portion of Basil's letters, *Basilio di Cesarea. Le lettere I*, Corona Patrum (Torino: Società Editrice Internationale, 1983). She is convinced by Fedwick's collation of the manuscripts which list the work under Basil or Gregory.

Begriffsmittel oder plotinischer Spekulationen zu bedienen."[5] That is, his overall position features some flexibility in allowing for recourse to Aristotelian method or Platonic concepts: "Das alles zeigt einmal mehr, daß man aus Basilius keinen stoischen Metaphysiker machen darf und sich hüten muß, alles nach einem Schema zu erklären. . . . Er hat, scheinbar unbekümmert um die logischen Implikationen der benutzten Begriffselemente, was ihm nützlich schien, aus allen Schulen der Philosophie zusammengesucht."[6]

So, Hübner focuses on the Stoic understanding of οὐσία in Basil. Although he allows for considerable influence stemming from the philosophy of Plotinus (although he never pursues this with any evidence), presumably having Basil's *De Spirito Sancto* in mind, he will allow for no Porphyrian elements in Basil at all, finding them only in the thought of Gregory of Nyssa. Perhaps this is the only really notable flaw in the study. It appears in bold relief when Hübner writes that

> Dabei ist aber zu bedenken, daß man bei einem Aristoteliker wie Alexander von Aphrodisias oder einem Neuplatoniker wie Dexippus, der um 350 seinen Kommentar zu den Kategorien schrieb, vieles Stoische findet. Zwischen ihnen und Basilius gibt es häufig auffallende terminologische und sachliche Parallelen, die sorgfältig zu prüfen wären, wenn man sich an die philosophischen Quellen des Basilius näher herantasten will.[7]

Yet Porphyry's *Isagoge* and commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* was itself influenced in important ways by Stoicism. This feature of Hübner's work asks for a closer look on Basil's sources, although he does mention the preference (standard long before the Fourth Century) for logical learning drawn from a Stoic handbook (εἰσαγωγὴ διαλεκτική),[8] which he assumes was subsumed within education at the hands of rhetors: "Die philosophischen Elemente, die sich bei ihm identifizieren lassen, sprechen dafür, daß er sein Wissen vor allem bei den synkretistischen Rhetoren erworben hat, die ihre Weltdeutung aus den Gedanken aller philosophischen Schulen zusammensetzten."[9] No doubt, Libanius, Himerius, Prohaeresius, and Basil's other instructors in the art of rhetoric had some acquaintance with Stoic

---

[5] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 482.

[6] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 483.

[7] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 482.

[8] Mates, *Stoic Logic*, 8. "Perhaps the saving circumstance was that the essentials of Stoic logic were brought together in handbooks not long after the time of Chrysippus. Such handbooks were commonly entitled 'Introduction to Logic' (εἰσαγωγὴ διαλεκτική), and evidently had a very wide circulation."

[9] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 482.

theory, but Basil's dialectical studies must have progressed beyond this rather minimal acquaintance with techniques of argument conditioned by Stoic logic.

With these preliminary observations in hand, Basil's conception of substance and related terms can be brought into consideration. There is no question that Basil powerfully influenced the development of trinitarian thought in the East through his clear distinction of the terms οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, which had previously been used in many of the same senses; though ὑπόστασις tended to be more strongly anchored in the meaning "reality" or "concrete existence,"[10] and thus no substance can truly be said to exist independent of our minds, if it exists in no hypostasis whatsoever (while Basil comes to say that divine substance exists ἐν ὑποστάσει insofar as it has its existence in three hypostases rather than a single hypostasis.) Thus, ὑπόστασις could be used to denote the distinctions in the godhead, the persons Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. However, Hübner's analysis would seem to presuppose a sort of dilemma, which was resolved more satisfactorily by Basil than by his brother Gregory: Basil insists that οὐσία is distinct from ὑπόστασις, and therefore it would be nonsensical or (more precisely) a confusion either of persons or of common and particular to maintain that divine substance subsists in its own hypostasis. Rather, the undivided substance subsists in three hypostases. Nor is it acceptable to conceive of substance as a concretely existing prior stuff which is divided up into individuals. Yet, as Hübner points out, Basil's early treatise *Contra Eunomium* testifies to a crux in his thinking with respect to these terms, for up to this point Basil has freely used οὐσία for "particular substance,"[11] as was typical among the Homoiousians, and even in the *Contra Eunomium* (*Eun.* 1.7) he uses οὐσία to designate the substance of one of the divine persons considered

---

[10] Nevertheless the term οὐσία is very close to this sense even in Basil, who uses it thus in the phrase κατ' οὐσίαν. Stead's excellent discussion in *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 134-136 demarcates this meaning from a fuller sense as 'substance' (138-142), although of course before Basil ὑποστάσις follows close upon the heels of οὐσία in most of its significations.

[11] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 481. For οὐσία used in a sense later dominated by ὑπόστασις, there are the examples: *Ep.* 361, 24-35 (Courtonne, 3.221), *Ep.* 9.3, 7-10 (Courtonne, 1.39), *Hom.* 23.4 (PG 31, 597C). Manlio Simonetti, "Genesi e sviluppo della dottrina trinitaria," *Basilio di Cesarea. La sua età, la sua opera e il Basilianesimo in Sicilia.* Atti del Congresso Internazionale (Messina: Centro di Studi Umonistici, 1983): 1.169-197 at 180 points out that Basil's liking for the phrase ὁμοιότης κατ' οὐσίαν (*Eun.* 2.22) also "sembra far assumere ancora a ousia il significato individuale caratteristico della dottrina omeousiana."

κατὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον, "with regard to the subject." On the other hand, confronted with the Neo-Arian insistence on a clear divergence in nature between the substance of the Father and of the Son, the orthodox position had to be demarcated by means of a common οὐσία (*Eun.* 1.15, 1.19, 2.4, 2.28).

Hübner thinks that Basil has recourse to Stoicism in order to find a solution to these difficulties. This logic places substance behind all determinations as an indefinite substrate (τὸ ὑποκείμενον), the primary (first) category; the second category is what is qualified (τὸ ποιόν), which is added to the underlying substrate to constitute all qualitatively determined things. Furthermore, among qualifieds there is a distinction drawn between generally qualifieds (κοινῶς ποιόν) which when combined with the substrate yield a quality corresponding to the Aristotelian genus or species, and particularly qualifieds (ἰδίως ποιόν) which yield concrete individuals, expressed in the Aristotelian system by primary substances. Hübner is at pains to point out that for the Stoics, neither the underlying substrate nor the common qualities exist taken by themselves;[12] only the concretely realized particulars actually exist in their own right. Basil's conception of substance and its successive determination into individuals, according to Hübner, displays close correspondences to the Stoics in method, and with respect to actual terms he compares the Stoic οὐσία = ἄποιος ὕλη = πρῶτον ὑποκείμενον to Basil's οὐσία = ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον (*Eun.* 1.15 and 2.4). Thus, the principal advantage of Basil's scheme is that he can logically ground the unity of the three hypostases with reference to the unity of substance (the Stoics also called this concept of being the "highest genus," τὸ ὄν): As he writes in *De Spiritu Sancto* after setting forth a logical table of successive classification and division of common into more particular, τὰ γὰρ ὑποδιαιρούμενα τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστιν ἐκείνοις οὐσίας ἀφ' ὧν διῄρηνται.[13] According to Hübner, he argues for unity of substance more adequately than Gregory of Nyssa, who takes the Aristotelian route in assigning the divine persons to a common species (εἶδος) and thus maintaining unity as members of a species.[14]

---

[12] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 480.

[13] Basil, *Sp. Sanct.* 17, 41.24-25 (SC 17: 394). The remark of Pruche (394-395) on this important passage is helpful, although he misses its significance for Basil's concept of substance. "Cette remarque vaut d'être soulignée: sur elle va s'appuyer la suite de l'argumentation. Basile en effet entend établir non pas l'ὅμοιος ni même l'ὁμοιούσιος des hypostases divines, mais, sous le biais de l'ὁμότιμος, leur consubstantialité de nature divine, en particulier celle du Saint-Esprit avec le Père et le Fils."

[14] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 482. There are a few texts in Basil that can be misleading, and seem to contradict his terminology as well as his logic elsewhere. Two outstanding exam-

As one might expect, the conceptual "fit" with Stoicism is weaker for the cosmological passages (*Hex.* 1.8, 6.3) than it is when Basil's theological statements are brought into consideration. And it certainly is true, as Hübner allows, that Basil's concept of being is at its basis twofold. Based on the basic metaphysical divide in Basil's thought between created things and God, "für Basilius gibt es also zwei οὐσίαι oder zweierlei Sein, den Seinsbegriff der geschaffenen Dinge und den Seinsbegriff Gottes. Das ist der Unterschied zur Stoa, die nur eine einzige οὐσία kennt."[15] But Hübner wants to maintain equally that "auf beiderlei οὐσίαι wendet er aber das stoische Modell der Seinsanalyse an." A distinction should be drawn here. In a passage such as *Eun.* 2.28 it is not difficult to detect a fundamentally different orientation from Stoic thought, *viz.* the prevalence of the Platonic doctrines of God's changelessness and divine simplicity.[16] There is no questioning the fact that *Eun.* 1.19 and 2.28 are entirely based on the traditional metaphysics of light. Furthermore, Basil consistently describes the substrate of God in terms of divine simplicity,[17] and similarly for perceptible things with respect to τὸ ὑποκείμενον.[18]

---

ples are *Ep.* 236.6, 1-3 (Courtonne, 3.53), Οὐσία δὲ καὶ ὑπόστασις ταυτὴν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἣν ἔχει τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον, οἷον ὡς ἔχει τὸ ζῷον πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα ἄνθρωπον, which might still be modified Stoic logic, and the formula in *Hom.* 24.4 (PG 31, 608C), Εἷς οὖν Θεὸς ἐπειδὴ δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἓν εἶδος θεωρεῖται ὁλοκλήρως ἐν ἀμφοτέροις δεικνύμενον. It is helpful to compare the usage here with the use of μορφή in Basil, as outlined by Franz Xaver Risch in his commentary on Pseudo-Basilius, *Adversus Eunomium* IV-V, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 16 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 116. Risch points out one passage, *Eun.* 1.18, 9-15 (SC 299: 236) (oriented towards *Phil.* 2,6) where Basil's concept of μορφή is very close to the οὐσία of God, while his normative use of the term is negative, implying composition or division in the divine nature, or upholding a difference of οὐσίαι. With less accuracy, Prestige discusses the text in *God in Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1952), 231.

[15] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 481.

[16] This emphasis continues into Basil's later writings, *e.g. Hom.* 24.4 (PG 31, 605B and 608B-C).

[17] Basil, *Eun.* 1.7, 12-15; 27-29 (SC 299: 188-190). Here, substrate and substance are virtually the same, as noted by Sesboüé, 189 note 4.

[18] Basil, *Eun.* 1.6, 54-57 (SC 299: 186-188). Yet as noted by Christopher Stead (*Divine Substance*, 122), the Stoics may have occasionally used οὐσία as an active principle, and in fact on this point there is a fine example from Philo in the phrase ἡ ἡγεμονικὴ οὐσία (*De Fuga* 165 (Starabinski-Safran, 226)), which in context would presuppose divine simplicity. Overall, the Stoic uses of ὑποκείμενον run closely parallel to those of οὐσία—even as the denotation of the first category the terms are interchangeable (Stead, 122). There is some debate as to whether the Stoic ὑποκείμενον is exactly the same as passive, unqualified matter (*cf.* Porphyry *ap.* Simplicius, *In Cat.* 48.11-16 (Kalbfleisch) = LS

On the other hand, Stoicism emphasizes the passivity of matter, as in an interesting fragment from Origen, κατὰ τούτους δὲ ἡ οὐσία ἐστὶν ἄποιός τε καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον λόγον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέγεθος ἀποτεταγμένον ἔχουσα, πάσῃ δὲ ἔκκειται ποιότητι καθάπερ ἕτοιμόν τι χωρίον. "According to them (*i.e.* the Stoics), substance is without qualities and unshapen by an account of its own nature, not even possessing a definite magnitude, but is available to every quality just like a receptive field."[19] More striking is the view expressed to the effect that matter has parts in which qualities are introduced, τὴν ὕλην ἀργὸν ἐξ ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἀκίνητον ὑποκεῖσθαι ταῖς ποιότησιν ἀποφαίνουσι, τὰς δὲ ποιότητας πνεύματα οὔσας καὶ τόνους ἀερώδεις, οἷς ἂν ἐγγένωνται μέρεσι τῆς ὕλης, εἰδοποιεῖν ἕκαστα καὶ σχηματίζειν. "They hold that matter, inactive and unmoved of itself, is subject to qualities, and that qualities are air currents and airy tensions, which form and fashion particulars in whichever parts of matter they penetrate."[20] Of course, Hübner is quite well aware of this, admitting that "dabei muß es noch kein Verlassen des stoischen Modells bedeuten, wenn Basilius die Seinssubstanz Gottes als Gottheit, Licht, Leben, Güte usw. oder das Gemeinsame des Menschen als 'Lebewesen' bestimmt, denn auch die Stoa machte durchaus inhaltliche Aussagen für die Weltsubstanz und ihre verschiedenen Aspekte."[21]

There is, however, one interesting similarity with Stoicism which Hübner does not address. In the important passage *Eun.* 2.28, Basil clearly associates divine activity or energy (ἐνεργεία) not with the substance of God but with the persons of the Trinity as distinguished by properties. The text reads, τὴν ἐνέργειαν δὲ τῶν γνωρισμάτων, ὥσπερ τι φῶς ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν

28E and Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1, 132.27-133.23 (Wachsmuth) = LS 28Q = SVF 1.87 and 2.317) or is a combination of active and passive principles (Posidonius 92 (Kidd and Edelstein)).

[19] SVF 2.318 = Origen, *De Oratione* (Koetschau, 2.368).

[20] FDS 842 = SVF 2.449.

[21] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 482. In contrast to Basil's physical theory Hübner cites Diogenes Laertius 7.137 (substance free of qualities is a mixture of the four elements), 7.142, and 7.156. The last passage cited is particularly relevant to the contrast, representing nature (God) as an active "constructive fire": δοκεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς τὴν μὲν φύσιν εἶναι πῦρ τεχνικόν, ὁδῷ βαδίζον εἰς γένεσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πνεῦμα πυροειδὲς καὶ τεχνοειδές τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αἰσθητικὴν [*sc.* φύσιν]. ταύτην δὲ εἶναι τὸ συμφυὲς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα διὸ καὶ σῶμα εἶναι καὶ μετὰ τὸν θάνατον ἐπιμένειν φθαρτὴν δὲ ὑπάρχειν. τὴν δὲ τῶν ὅλων ἄφθαρτον, ἧς μέρη εἶναι τὰ ἐν τοῖς ζῴοις. "They think that nature is constructive fire, making its way into coming-to-be, which is fiery and technical 'breath', and that nature is the soul which perceives. But this nature is 'breath' which is of the same nature as us, and therefore it is body and endures after death while it is corruptible. And the nature of the whole is incorruptible, whose parts are living creatures."

ἐντιθέντα, πρὸς τὴν ἐφικτὴν ταῖς διανοίαις σύνεσιν [τὰ ἰδιώματα] ὁδηγεῖ. "And the properties introduce the activity of the distinguishing characteristics in our souls, as a certain light, guiding to the comprehension accessible to human minds."[22] Elsewhere, in two passages which are both probably considerably later than the *Contra Eunomium*, Basil speaks of the possibility of conceiving God through the ἐνέργειαι as distinguished from the unknowable οὐσία, without associating the energies with the divine hypostases.[23] This usage is not surprising, since Basil never speaks of divine activity strictly with respect to divine substance, preferring to relegate this to persons or to a common unity of divine activity; in point of fact, it recalls Stoic theories (the term is not represented at all in Plato). For the Stoics, ἐνεργεία is a key term in their theory of individuation. For example, in a passage from Simplicius treating opposites and things opposed by negation (ἀποφατικῶς) which would bear comparison profitably with Basil's theory on the topic, is found the statement, ὑπὸ ταύτας [τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κακίαν] γὰρ καὶ ποιότητες καὶ ποιὰ καὶ ἐνέργειαι καὶ πᾶν ὁτιοῦν ἐστι.[24] Again, in the passage from Origen partially cited above, ποιότητας δὲ διατακτικῶς λέγουσι τὰς ἐνεργείας καὶ τὰς ποιήσεις κοινῶς, ἐν αἷς εἶναι τὰς κινήσεις καὶ τὰς σχέσεις συμβέβηκεν "they arrange the activities and effects under the heading 'qualities,' in which it happens that there are movements and formations,"[25] which implies that activities can be thought of as virtually the same as qualities, and that activity is the differentiation of unshaped οὐσία. The comparison becomes even more evident if one accepts the contention of Hübner that "ποιότης und ἰδίωμα sind bei Basilius sinngleich." Finally, an involvement or subsumption within the class of δύναμις might appear as a later development of Stoic thought, if Simplicius' testimony can be trusted,[26]

---

[22] Basil, *Eun.* 2.28, 51-53 (SC 305: 120). Square brackets are my own for purposes of clarification.

[23] Basil, *Hom.* 3, *In Illud Attende* (Rudberg, 35.20-22): οὔτε γὰρ κέχρωσται οὔτε ἐσχημάτισται [*sc.* ὁ Θεὸς] . . . ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν γνωρίζεται μόνον. *Ep.* 234.1, 28-31 (Courtonne, 3.42): ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐκ μὲν τῶν ἐνεργειῶν γνωρίζειν λέγομεν τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, τῇ δὲ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῇ προσεγγίζειν οὐχ ὑπισχνούμεθα. αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐνέργειαι αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς καταβαίνουσιν, ἡ δὲ οὐσία αὐτοῦ μένει ἀπρόσιτος. For the dating, Paul Fedwick (9 notes 31 and 32) places the letter at the beginning of 376, and the homily between 363 and 378, probably earlier than the *Hexaemeron* although it fits well with it, in his contribution "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea," *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*, ed. Paul J. Fedwick (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981): 1.3-19.

[24] Simplicius, *In Cat.* 406.2-3 (Kalbfleisch) = SVF 2.175. Square brackets again are for purposes of clarification.

[25] SVF 2.318.

[26] Simplicius, *In Cat.* 224.19-33 = FDS 865.

where δύναμις is defined as ἡ πλειόνων ἐποιστικὴ συμπτωμάτων or as ἡ κατακρατοῦσα τῶν ὑποτασσομένων ἐνεργειῶν. Simplicius also uses the phrase ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν ποιότητα δυνάμει, but unfortunately Simplicius may be confusing here Stoic theory with the Peripatetic association of capacity with quality (Aristotle, *Cat.* 9a14-28), as his initial referent is to a Plotinian passage (*Enneads* VI.1.10) which addresses the Aristotelian system of categories. It is less likely that ποιότης was ever associated with the λόγος σπερματικός, since the evidence is only found in Plotinus, who might well be interpreting Stoicism with this in mind.[27]

It may be the case that the ἐνεργεία doctrine presented a problem which Basil thought about over an extended period of time. Basil's theory in the *Contra Eunomium* regarding ἐνέργεια constitutes an important difference from the doctrine of the *De Spirito Sancto*, where Basil speaks quite a lot about the ἐνέργεια of the Holy Spirit in illuminating human minds so that they can see the light of the Word.[28] That is, the Holy Spirit takes over the role that the ἰδιώματα of the undivided divine substance perform in the *Contra Eunomium*.

To continue with evaluating the case which Hübner so carefully constructs, it might appear that the two troublesome τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον passages[29] in Basil furnish him with excellent evidence. This, plus the observation of D.L. Balás of Gregory's outright rejection of the concept,[30] would indicate a divergence of philosophical inclination of Gregory of Nyssa, while pointing straight to the Stoic assimilation of the concept of being and the material substrate in Basil's thought. It affords additional undergirding for a signification of οὐσία as a real entity as opposed to an abstract concept. Also, Hübner can cite ample testimony that for Basil there is no "higher" οὐσία subsuming and transcending both Father and Son.[31] He neglects to mention, however, that one of the passages under his thumb throws out the ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον in the case of God, if understood in one way. This text (from one of Basil's letters to Apollinarius) reads, ἐφ' ὧν οὔτε γένος κοινὸν ὑπερκείμενον θεωρεῖται οὔτε ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον προϋπάρχον, οὐκ ἀπομερισμὸς τοῦ προτέρου εἰς τὸ

---

[27] Plotinus, *Enneads* VI.1.29 = FDS 837.

[28] *E.g.* Basil, *Sp. Sanct.* 26, 61.13-16 (SC 17: 68).

[29] Basil, *Eun.* 1.15, 30-35 (SC 299: 226); 2.4, 3-13 (SC 305: 18-20).

[30] D.L. Balás, "The Unity of Human Nature in Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's Polemics against Eunomius," *Studia Patristica* 14.3 (1976): 275-281. The apparent correction of these passages in Basil is found in the *Contra Eunomium* of Gregory of Nyssa, 3.5.22 (Jaeger, 168.2-3).

[31] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 475 note 63.

δεύτερον.[32] No doubt, Hübner would simply counter with the claim that Basil, who expressly will not tolerate a partition of a prior divine substance into particulars, has purged such material conditions from his theological thinking. That is, he receives the Stoic model when considering the individuation of the three men or the οὐσία of Adam,[33] and then applies the model by analogy to God. So, these considerations do not invalidate Hübner's argument regarding the ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον passages in the *Contra Eunomium*, but they do call for some explanation. Similarly, it is fundamental to the Stoic view of material particulars that they are not a compound of qualities alone, but rather "bits of substance" which admit division and blending, for the Stoics thought of particulars as complete mixtures of qualities and primary οὐσία. In this way, every uniquely qualified particular is a part of a whole.[34]

Another difficulty is brought to light in the study which contradicts Basil's normative preferences. The expression of the consubstantiality of all men as their formation from clay (*Job* 33.6) in *Eun.* 2.4 troubles Hübner[35] insofar as it seems to commit Basil to the concrete existence of a prior ur-

---

[32] Basil, *Ep.* 361, 19-22 (Courtonne, 3.221).

[33] Another passage in the correspondence with Apollinarius (*Ep.* 362, 14-19 (Courtonne, 3.222)) does not mention the rejected ἀπομερισμός, but probably presupposes it, since as treated above the Stoics viewed the constitution of individuals as the partition of matter: Ταύτῃ γέ τοι καὶ ἓν εἶναι γένος ὑπερκείμενον ἢ μίαν ὕλην ὑποκειμένην ἐπὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ περιαιρεθήσεται τῶν ὑπονοιῶν, ὅταν τὴν γεναρχικὴν περιλάβωμεν ἰδιότητα τῆς ἀνωτάτω ἀρχῆς καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν γενάρχων γένη πρὸς τὸ ἐκ τῆς μιᾶς ἀρχῆς μονογενὲς γέννημα. "In this way, to be sure, our opinions will be purged from positing a single overarching genus or a single material substrate for both the Father and the Son, whenever we hold firmly to the originating quality of the highest principle and the kinds from the first principle in relation to the only-begotten offspring from the one principle."

[34] John M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 158. Two texts are worth citing: FDS 741 = SVF 2.317 Χρυσίππου Στωικοῦ. Τῶν κατὰ ποιότητα ὑφισταμένων πρώτην ὕλην· ταύτην δὲ ἀΐδιον, οὔτε αὔξησιν οὔτε μείωσιν ὑπομένουσαν, διαίρεσιν δὲ καὶ σύγχυσιν ἐπιδεχομένην κατὰ μέρη, ὥστε φθορὰς γίγνεσθαι ἔκ τίνων μερῶν εἴς τινα {οὐ} κατὰ διαίρεσιν, ἅμα κατ' ἀναλογίαν τῇ συγχύσει τινῶν γιγνομένων ἔκ τινων. "Of Chrysippus the Stoic. Of the things subject to qualification matter is primary. And matter is eternal, neither undergoing increase nor decrease, but receiving division and confusion in its parts, so that some parts are destroyed while others are not. According to division (matter is corrupted), together with the confusion by analogy of some things coming to be from other things." Also, from Diogenes Laertius (7.150 = FDS 742 = SVF 2.316, 2.482, 1.87), καλεῖται δὲ διχῶς, οὐσία τε καὶ ὕλη, ἥ τε τῶν πάντων καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους.

[35] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 476. The difficulty is examined in conjunction with a text from *Eun.* 2.19 regarding the homoousion of producer with product.

stuff which is split up into human individuals. There is really no place for this conception (derived from Basil's exegesis) in Hübner's schema, although he suggests that the clay could be understood as a second substrate, the κοινῶς ποιόν in the Stoic sense—but this is a faulty understanding of Stoicism, as Rist demonstrates; it is possible for the Stoics to speak of two and only two substrates, the οὐσία and quality fused with matter *qua* particular substance (ποιόν), but they can hardly speak of an existent common ποιόν in most cases.[36] For Hübner this is clearly the counsel of desperation, positing a correspondence with "metal" in the Stoic examples of generally qualified genera.[37] Ultimately, no secure logical basis for this can be found, and it

---

[36] Rist, *Stoic Philosophy*, 164-167.

[37] FDS 834 and 835 = SVF 2.374. The latter text (from Dexippus' commentary on the *Categories*, 23.25-24.4 (Busse)) which also distinguishes two senses of ὑποκείμενον, includes the well-known statement, which may have misled Hübner, for any type of metal is already to some extent a (distributed in location) uniquely qualified particular: δεύτερον δὲ ὑποκείμενον τὸ ποιόν, ὃ κοινῶς ἢ ἰδίως ὑφίσταται· ὑποκείμενον γὰρ καὶ ὁ χαλκὸς καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης τοῖς ἐγγινομένοις ἢ κατηγορουμένοις κατ' αὐτῶν. Mario Mignucci ("The Stoic Notion of Relatives," *Matter and Metaphysics*. Fourth Symposium Hellenisticum, eds. Barnes and Mignucci (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1988): 131-217) argues (176-177) that here the example of "bronze" should not lead the interpreter to conclude that matter fulfills the first category in that "all possible pieces of matter which are going to be qualified are members of the first category." This cannot be allowed, for "one might ask whether it is reasonable to speak of 'unqualified pieces of matter'. Matter needs qualification to be differentiated in any way. Bronze is not a bare, but a qualified, piece of matter, and it is precisely its qualification which distinguishes it from another substrate, for instance a piece of gold. Bare pieces of matter do not exist and therefore, one might say, the extension of the first category is empty, if they are taken to constitute its members." But of course the Stoics did not leave the first category empty in extension. The "elements of the first category are things or entities . . . *qua* matter, *i.e.* pieces of qualified matter whose qualification we do not consider. The same things *qua* qualified pieces of matter constitute the members of the second category." Thus, Mignucci argues, the Stoics thought of the categories as "constituted by the things themselves considered from a certain point of view." This interpretation of the Stoic categories, shared roughly by Rist, is confirmed by a text in Porphyry's commentary on the *Categories* (*In Cat.* 140.30-141.4 (Busse)). Here Porphyry is defending Aristotle's placement of ἕξις in two separate categories, in a way that is evocative of Stoicism: an identical entity is described differently in different categories, maintaining its unity, yet considered from different points of view. It may also be noted of this text from Dexippus that many of the things added, as opposed to the primary substrate, are in the other substrate not as ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ but as μέρη (*cf.* FDS 839). Also regarding the relation of commonly to individually qualified things is a fragment (28.15-19 (Kroll) = FDS 849 = SVF 2.398) from Syrianus' commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστά ἐστι, καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ δὲ τοὺς κοινῶς ποιοὺς πρὸ τῶν ἰδίως ποιῶν ἀποτίθενται. The claim

represents an inconsistency, derived from a point of biblical exegesis, with the rest of his system: "Vielleicht war es nur die vorgegebene Aussage der Schrift, die Basilius zu dieser uns so verwirrenden Illustration bewogen hat."[38] It is probable that it was not to the liking of Gregory of Nyssa either, and so he undertakes to set the matter aright in his thinking about the unity of the human race as created by God in the *De Hominis Opificio*, and later developed in the *Ad Graecos* and *Ad Ablavium*.[39]

In another quarter, Hübner's attempted resolution of a puzzle is also not very convincing. Although it does little to damage his general argument, at least with regard to Basil's logical basis for theological statements, Hübner is surely incorrect in his interpretation of the important and central conception signified by ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος, which he supposes can be brought into alignment with the Stoic model. Hübner handles the problem of ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος by translating it "Begriff des Seins" and claiming that it may be understood as "substance," "das erste zugrundeliegende Sein der Einzeldinge" according to the Stoic conception,[40] in all cases. Of the six occurrences of ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος in Basil's dogmatic works,[41] five are identical in meaning while one (cosmological) is quite different, and therefore will be examined first.

There is a definite inconsistency between the two passages in Basil's

---

that things qualified κοινῶς are prior to things qualified ἰδίως must refer to a procedure of classification from οὐσία to particulars, or perhaps Syrianus has read a notion of secondary substance into Stoic thought.

[38] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 480.

[39] Gregory's theory is discussed and evaluated by Christopher Stead, "Individual Personality in Origen and the Cappadocian Fathers," *Arché e Telos. L'antropologia di Origene e di Gregorio di Nissa. Analisi storico-religiosa*, Atti del Colloquio (Milano, 17-19 maggio 1979), Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 12 (Milano: 1981): 179-191 at 187-190.

[40] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 481. A more accurate view of the matter appears in his later article, "Basilius von Caesarea und das *Homoousios*," *Christian Faith and Greek philosophy in Late Antiquity*, eds. Lionel R. Wickham and Caroline P. Bammel (Leiden: Brill, 1993): 70-91 at 82. "Die *ousia* ist hier das (stoffliche) Substrat (ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον), ein Begriff, der sich am zwanglosesten in Analogie zur stoischen unqualifizierten oder erst teilweise qualifizierten *ousia* verstehen läßt und den Basilius analog auch für das Sein der trinitarischen Hypostasen verwendet. . . . Wo Basilius diese Anwendung macht, taucht zur Bestimmung des gemeinsamen Seinssubstrats von Vater und Sohn auch wieder jene bereits aus dem Brief an Apollinarius (*Ep.* 361) bekannte Überlegung auf, daß sich das Licht, das der Vater ist, vom Licht, das der Sohn ist, nicht unterscheide."

[41] These passages, which include one occurrence from the *Hexaemeron*, three from the letters, and two from one passage of the *Contra Eunomium*, are exhaustive according to a search conducted by means of the computerized TLG.

Hexaemeron which treat the nature of the substrate (τὸ ὑποκείμενον) of all perceptible things. The text in which ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος occurs, *Hex.* 1.8,[42] represents a "bundle theory" of matter (matter is created as a συνδρομή of concepts or thoughts)[43] in agreement with the physical theory of Gregory of Nyssa,[44] as compared to the conventional Aristotelian analysis of substance and qualities which emerges so clearly from *Hex.* 6.3.[45] With weak justification, Hübner assimilates the philosophy of these two texts not only to each other "ganz im Sinne der erläuterten stoischen Auffassung des aus Substrat und Qualitäten zusammengesetzten konkreten Seienden," but also to the schema employed in *Eun.* 2.28 for the differentiation of common substance and individual.[46] As he has it, both passages from the *Hexaemeron* contain the doctrine that everything is a compound of οὐσία free of all qualities identified as substrate, and the qualities which are added to it which occupy the οὐσία. Indeed, the portion of the text which he quotes from *Hex.* 1.8 sustains his reading:

> Τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ περὶ τῆς γῆς συμβουλεύωμεν ἑαυτοῖς, μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖν αὐτῆς τὴν οὐσίαν ἥτις ποτέ ἐστι, μηδὲ κατατρίβεσθαι τοῖς λογισμοῖς αὐτὸ τὸ ὑποκείμενον ἐκζητοῦντας, μηδὲ ζητεῖν τινα φύσιν ἔρημον ποιοτήτων, ἄποιον ὑπάρχουσαν τῷ ἑαυτῆς λόγῳ, ἀλλ' εὖ εἰδέναι, ὅτι πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν θεωρούμενα εἰς τὸν τοῦ εἶναι κατατέτακται λόγον, συμπληρωτικὰ τῆς οὐσίας ὑπάρχοντα.
>
> Let us advise ourselves with these same considerations also in the case of the earth, not bothering about the substance of the earth, what it is, nor waste time in reasoned inquiry regarding the substrate itself, nor looking for a certain nature without qualities, being unqualified by the account of its own nature, but let us know well, that everything which is observed in relation to it has been appointed in its rational account of being, forming a part of its substance.

The line of thought is clearly truncated if left here, as the next bit shows. The rest reads,

> Εἰς οὐδὲν γὰρ καταλήξεις, ἑκάστην τῶν ἐνυπαρχουσῶν αὐτῇ ποιοτήτων ὑπεξαιρεῖσθαι τῷ λόγῳ πειρώμενος. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀποστήσῃς τὸ μέλαν, τὸ ψυχρόν, τὸ βαρύ, τὸ πυκνόν, τὰς κατὰ γεῦσιν ἐνυπαρχούσας αὐτῇ ποιότητας, ἢ εἴ τινες ἄλλαι περὶ αὐτὴν θεωροῦνται, οὐδὲν ἔσται τὸ ὑποκείμενον.

---

[42] Basil, *Hex.* 1.8 (SC 26: 120-122).

[43] Discussed by Richard Sorabji, *Time, Creation, and the Continuum* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 290-294, who compares with Neoplatonic theories (Plotinus and Porphyry).

[44] *Cf.* Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom. Opif.* PG 44, 213C.

[45] Basil, *Hex.* 6.3 (SC 26: 336).

[46] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 479.

> At nothingness will you end, if you attempt to substract by the reason each of the qualities which adhere to it. For it you remove the black, the cold, the heavy, the bitter, the qualities of taste which qualify it, or if some other qualities are observed in relation to it, the substrate will be no more.

That is, Basil thinks that it is vain to look for a nature stripped of qualities, for there is no such entity. At least this text could furnish the rough analogy to Basil's theological concept of οὐσία which Hübner claims, and in fact it is paralleled by a text in the *Contra Eunomium* which offers philosophical support to the doctrine of the unknowability of God's essence.[47] As for ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος, it must refer in this context to the ordered structure of created things (κατατάσσειν).

Away from cosmology, Basil's theological use looks a bit closer to Hübner's "Begriff des Seins." But this cannot imply that Basil will accept ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος as "concept of being" if it means an abstract idea above and prior to the persons of the Trinity, for Basil emphatically rejects this on more than one occasion.[48] On this point, J. Lebon is misled, and so he thinks that this is a different presentation of οὐσία than when Basil speaks ontologically. "Ainsi, l'extrême fréquence de l'emploi d'expressions telles que ὁ λόγος τῆς οὐσίας, ὁ κοινὸς τῆς οὐσίας λόγος, ἡ ἔννοια τῆς οὐσίας, ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος, ,paraissent reléguer dans l'ordre abstrait et de concept ce qu' on reconnaît comme commun, comme unique, en plusieurs êtres individuels."[49] Undoubtedly, part of Lebon's misreading is his trust in the authenticity of *Ep.* 38, which leads him to a Basilian view of οὐσία as a common genus in connection with ὁ τῆς οὐσίας λόγος. If the profound impact of Stoicism on Gregory and Basil is overlooked, then an accurate evaluation of their theological and cosmological outlook is impossible, and the scholar is liable to shoehorn οὐσία into a Platonic framework as πρὸ τῶν πολλῶν rather than the solid Stoic concept of substance ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς.[50] This is the primary fault of Lebon, who seeks to overcome the insistence of his predecessors on looking at the Cappadocians through Aristotelian spectacles,[51] and does

---

[47] Basil, *Eun.* 1.12, 30-1.13, 24 (SC 299: 214-218).

[48] Basil, *Ep.* 236.6, 9-10 (Courtonne, 3.53); *Sp. Sanct.* 17, 41.18-21 (SC 17: 394).

[49] J. Lebon, "Le Sort du 'Consubstantiel' Nicéen (suite)," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 48 (1953): 632-682 at 672.

[50] On this matter, it is not as straightforward to assert this for Aristotelians as it is for Stoics due to the confusion between properties in things and predicates in statements in the *Categories*, as discussed by A.C. Lloyd, "Neo-platonic Logic and Aristotelian Logic-II," *Phronesis* 1 (1955-1956): 146-160 at 153-155.

[51] This tendency is perhaps best represented by Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadozieren dargestellt* (Tübingen-Leipzig: 1904). Inevitably,

manage to make some headway for Basil by seeing clearly the concrete yet undivided reality of the common divine οὐσία. But as Basil says in the *De Spirito Sancto*, a sense of οὐσία as pure concept would violate the all-important condition for what is common to the persons, that it must be anchored in concrete reality in order to avoid the mistake, φάναι τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων, ὥσπερ κοινότητά τινα, λόγῳ μόνῳ θεωρητὴν, ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ δὲ ὑποστάσει τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσαν, εἰς τὰ ὑποκείμενα διαιρεῖσθαι.[52] Basil's intent is far from this, as the following text from the *Contra Eunomium* shows.

> Εἰ δὲ οὕτω τις ἐκλαμβάνοι τὸ τῆς οὐσίας κοινόν, ὡς τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν θεωρεῖσθαι καὶ, εἰ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν φῶς ὁ Πατὴρ τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ νοοῖτο, φῶς καὶ τὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς οὐσίαν ὁμολογεῖσθαι. . . . Κατὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ θεότης μία.[53]
>
> But if someone should conceive what is common to substance in this way, so that one and the same rational account of being is found in the case of both, and, if by supposition the Father is thought as light with respect to the substrate, light also is confessed as the substance of the Only-begotten. . . . In this way the godhead is one.

It might be said that the words τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον can in one sense be understood apophatically, and indeed this aspect of any λόγος of God's being (for Basil thinks that it is denied to human beings to fully conceive the οὐσία of God) must lie behind the passage as part of Basil's inheritance from Athanasius;[54] this might imply that the λόγος of God's being is only fully comprehensible to the λόγος of the Father, since the inner rationality of the divine being is knowable in itself but not something to be grasped by us.[55] But this does not give the proper sense of this terminology.

Basil suffers (132-135) under the assumption of an Aristotelian scheme to which he is not faithful, and accordingly Holl (134-135) assumes that Basil simply finds the system of the Categories to be inadequate. Rather, as Hübner argues, the Stoic procedure of individuation helps to explain why the λόγος of the common οὐσία characterizes differently than the qualities associated with the hypostases.

[52] Basil, *Sp. Sanct.* 17, 41.18-21 (SC 17: 394).

[53] Basil, *Eun.* 1.19, 32-36 and 40 (SC 299: 240-242).

[54] Athanasius, *Decr.* 22.1-3 (Opitz, 18).

[55] This use of the terminology is found in at least two passages of Gregory of Nyssa's *Contra Eunomium*, where a λόγος of substance is used in the sense of "knowledge of what God is" unattainable to created minds. Thus, the knowledge of the creator is impossible given that even comprehensive knowledge of the cosmos is beyond human reach (*Eun.* 2.71 (Jaeger, 248.1-3)): οὕτω καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου ὅτι μὲν ἔστιν οἴδαμεν, τὸν δὲ τῆς οὐσίας λόγον ἀγνοεῖν οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα. Cf. ὁ λόγος τῆς κτίσεως (*Eun.* 2.78 (Jaeger, 249.30-250.1)). The unknowability of divine οὐσία is also referred to the λόγος of God's being at *Eun.* 2.102 (Jaeger, 256.23-25).

Rather, Basil uses this to signify the proper and correct definition of God's nature not as one might describe τὸ κοινὸν *per se* but as it is grounded in the hypostases, manifested as the same for Father and Son; in one passage Basil distinguishes between the question "what God is" (τί ἐστιν) and the question "how God is" (ὅπως ἐστίν), reserving the applicability of the predicates "ingenerate," "generate," *etc.* for the latter, while the predicates that are used in the λόγος of being supply limited answers to the first question.[56] Thus, the substrate of Father and Son is described as light, and a bit further on Basil emphasizes that the definition of being (ὅνπερ ἄν τις ἀποδῷ . . . τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον) must be the same, and not said homonymously, for both persons of the Trinity, *i.e.* the properties of simplicity, incorruptibility, goodness, immutability, *etc.*

Further evidence for this interpretation may be readily discerned when two other uses of the parallel terminology ὁ τῆς οὐσίας λόγος are compared, the one from the portion that follows immediately upon the passage just discussed, and a later passage in a letter to the bishop of Iconium, Amphilochius. From the *Contra Eunomium* is found the statement, Κατὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ θεότης μία· δηλονότι κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον τῆς ἑνότητος νοουμένης, ὥστε ἀριθμῷ μὲν τὴν διαφορὰν ὑπάρχειν καὶ ταῖς ἰδιότησι ταῖς χαρακτηριζούσαις ἑκάτερον· ἐν δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς θεότητος, τὴν ἑνότητα θεωρεῖσθαι. "In this way the godhead is one, namely when the oneness is conceived according to the rational account of substance; so that there is a difference in number and in the characteristics distinguishing each, but the oneness is found in the rational account of divinity."[57] Again, from *Ep.* 214: Ἕκαστος γὰρ ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς οὐσίας λόγῳ τοῦ εἶναι μετέχει καὶ τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν ἰδιώμασιν ὁ δεῖνά ἐστι καὶ ὁ δεῖνα. Οὕτω κἀκεῖ ὁ μὲν τῆς οὐσίας λόγος κοινός, οἷον ἡ ἀγαθότης, ἡ θεότης, ἢ εἴ τι ἄλλο νοοῖτο. "Each of us both by a common difinition of substance partakes in (the common qualities of) being, and by further individuating characteristics is a certain person. Likewise in the case of God,

---

[56] Basil, *Eun.* 1.15, 1-37 (SC 299: 224-226). Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium*, 136 explains the distinction as between hypostatic and essential predicates. Manlio Simonetti, "Genesi e sviluppo," 178 discusses the importance of the distinction in the course of Basil's development of thought, linking this point to the distinction between absolute and relative names. Gregory of Nyssa similarly draws a distinction (*Quod Non Sint Tres Dei*, 56.11-57.13 (Mueller)) between ὁ τῆς φύσεως λόγος and ὁ τῆς αἰτίας λόγος, reserving the latter for marking out the hypostases (τὸ πῶς ἐστι) and the former for τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως (τὸ τί ἐστι). A restatement of τὸ τί ἐστι is given as ἡ δὲ θεία φύσις ἀπαράλλακτός τε καὶ ἀδιαίρετος διὰ πάσης ἐννοίας καταλαμβάνεται.

[57] Basil, *Eun.* 1.19, 40-44 (SC 299: 242).

the rational account of substance is common, including for example goodness, divinity, or if something else is thought."[58] Starting with the bit from *Ep.* 214, it cannot be the case that participation in being (τοῦ εἶναι μετέχει) is conceived simply as generic or specific unity, as would appear if "man" or "God" was understood in the sense of Aristotelian secondary substance. Rather, the unity of common properties reflects the unity of the substrate which the properties truly characterize while necessarily falling short of the ineffable light. Then, the text from *Ep.* 236 may be compared: Οὐσία δὲ καὶ ὑπόστασις ταύτην ἔχει τὴν διαφοράν, ἣν ἔχει τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον· οἷον, ὡς ἔχει τὸ ζῷον πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα ἄνθρωπον. διὰ τοῦτο οὐσίαν μὲν μίαν ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὥστε τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον μὴ διαφόρως ἀποδιδόναι. "Substance and hypostasis have this difference, which what is common has in relation to what is individual; for example, as the quality 'living creature' has in relation to the particular man. On account of this, we confess that the substance is one in the case of the godhead, with the result that the rational account of being is not applied inconsistently."[59] It may be objected that the illustration of Basil's concept from the individuation of human beings damages the strong sense of unity that he wants, but one must bear in mind that this is only an illustration from an inferior level of being; Basil must have in mind a (necessarily) limited definition composed of divine characteristics, not Aristotelian accidents, or properties which are unchanging attributes not constituting part of the definition of a substance. Thus, Basil defines the common divine substance by means of partial characterizations, though it remains incomprehensible and perfectly simple, similar in this respect to the thought of Athanasius.

It is instructive to recognize that this sort of thinking about the common οὐσία is well-represented in Gregory of Nyssa's short treatise *De Differentia Essentiae et Hypostaseos*, often listed (incorrectly) as *Ep.* 38 of Basil. Gregory lists a few of the characteristics of the divine nature which are limited by apophatic consideration, and applies them to each member of the Trinity.

> Πῶς τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅ τι ποτὲ ὑποτίθεταί σου ἡ ἔννοια (πρὸς οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ἀποτεταγμένον νόημα τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπερείδειν, διὰ τὸ πεπεῖσθαι αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν εἶναι νόημα) τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ νοήσει, τοῦτο ὡσαύτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ· Ἁγίου. Ὁ γὰρ τοῦ ἀκτίστου καὶ τοῦ ἀκαταλήπτου λόγος εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπί τε

[58] Basil, *Ep.* 214.4, 9-13 (Courtonne, 2.205).

[59] Basil, *Ep.* 236.6, 1-5 (Courtonne, 3.53).

> τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματός ἐστιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ μὲν μᾶλλον ἀκατάληπτόν τε καὶ ἄκτιστον, τὸ δὲ ἧττον.[60]
>
> In whatever manner and as whatever thing your mind conceives of the substance of the Father (for there is no circumscribed thought for the soul to lean upon, because we are sure that it is beyond every conception), this will apply also to the Son, and likewise to the Holy Spirit. For the rational account of what is uncreated and beyond comprehension is one and the same in the case of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. For there is no more and less for what is uncreated and beyond comprehension.

Yet Gregory's treatise shows clear signs of a heightened Aristotelian conceptuality, and Hübner is surely correct to distinguish his approach from that of Basil,[61] for Gregory favors what most scholars refer to as the trademark Cappadocian unity of individuals within a common species.[62] As for Gregory's view of consubstantiality here, he grounds it exclusively in the common λόγος of οὐσία.[63] In fact, this Aristotelian approach to ὁ τῆς οὐσίας λόγος is found elsewhere in Gregory's writings, notably in a passage of his *Contra Eunomium* which presents a (fallacious) *reductio ad absurdum* of Eunomius' view of graduated divinity starting from the doctrine of the *Categories* (3b33), "substance can not be more and less than substance."[64]

More light can be shed on the problems of unity and definition of substance in Basil by comparison with the thought of his opponent Eunomius. Eunomius insists that the names "the unbegotten" (τὸ ἀγέννητον) and "the

---

[60] [Basil], *Ep.* 38.3, 33-41 (Courtonne, 1.83-84); *cf.* 2, 19-26 (Courtonne, 1.81).

[61] In his recent monograph *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), V.H. Drecoll argues at length against a different notion of divine οὐσία in *Ep.* 38 as compared to other works securely ascribed to Basil. Short of a detailed critique of Drecoll's case, it must suffice here to note that Hübner (486-488) can draw upon important similarities between *Ep.* 38 and Gregory's *De Hominis Opficio* besides other short dogmatic treatises, while Drecoll largely ignores these points and is content to point out differences between *Ep.* 38 and Gregory's *Ad Eustathium* on the one hand, and similarities with a few of Basil's later letters of theological significance on the other. Least convincing of all is Drecoll's insistence (312) that *Ep.* 38 does not feature a species notion of divine unity, nor does it follow that the species "God" would lead to outright tritheism, if balanced by the unity forged by the traditional relations between divine persons in the order Father-Son-Spirit (*Ep.* 38.4, 16ff. (Courtonne 1.85-86)).

[62] *E.g.* [Basil], *Ep.* 38.2, 1-3 *et seq.* (Courtonne, 1.81); *cf.* Porphyry, *Is.* 2a2-5 and 2b21-26 (4.11-14 and 6.19-23 (Busse)).

[63] [Basil], *Ep.* 38.2, 24-26 (Courtonne, 1.81).

[64] Gr. Nyss., *Eun.* 1.184 (Jaeger, 80.25-81.6).

begotten" (τὸ γέννημα) designate realities (τὰ πράγματα) which can have nothing in common.[65] He also believes that every substance can be designated by one and only one name, if it is assigned properly, and argues in his *Apology* that any ground of similarity of substance must entail an identity of substance. This last point deserves a little elaboration, for it is crucial to the business of definition for Eunomius. In one passage, the scheme of argument is that if a comparison is made between substances, there must be some common basis upon which the comparison can be made, and thus the inference is that the "fundamental principle" or "proper quality" of substance must be common, and no difference as to substance can be upheld. The text reads, in the compressed style typical of Eunomius and his teacher Aetius, εἴτε τὴν πρὸς ἕτερον δέχοιτο σύγκρισιν, τῆς συγκρίσεως οὐκ ἐκ ἀκοινωνήτων γιγνομένης, κοινοποιηθήσεται τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἀξίωμα, εἰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ τοὔνομα.[66] The missing premises are (1) substances which are comparable possess at least one common property, and (2) any possible basis for comparison constitutes a shared "proper quality" of substance. Apparently, Eunomius' concept of definition of substance exhibits a severe reduction in the possibilities for characterization of substances. Elsewhere, Eunomius attempts to show that no coherent avenue for speaking of a common ground underlying the names of the Ingenerate (Father) and Son can be found: πᾶσα γὰρ γένοιτο σύγχυσις ὀνομάτων τε καὶ πραγμάτων, μιᾶς μὲν οὐσίας οὔσης τε καὶ λεγομένης ἀγεννήτου, ἐπεισαγομένης δὲ τῷ λόγῳ πάλιν ἑτέρας, εἶτα ταύτης γεννητῆς ὀνομαζομένης.[67] Here, it is clear that Eunomius regards definition (τῷ λόγῳ) as senseless if more than one kind of substance falls within its aegis; every property which is correctly given designates the respective substances themselves, and other terms (such as "light" or "life") can have no meaning different than "unbegotten," or *mutatis mutandis* when applied to the Son "begotten."[68]

Clearly Eunomius constructed this position against the views of Basil's early theological associates in the Homoiousian party, which adopted the formula ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν at the Council of Ancyra in 358.[69] This formula

---

[65] Eunomius, *Ap.* 14.5-6 (Vaggione, 50).

[66] Eunomius, *Ap.* 9.10-12 (Vaggione, 44).

[67] Eunomius, *Ap.* 14.6-8 (Vaggione, 50).

[68] Eunomius, *Ap.* 19 (Vaggione, 56-58).

[69] Vaggione in his Introduction to the *Apology*, 9. Basil's relations with these theologians are related to his conception of consubstantiality by Reinhard Hübner, 76-77 of "Basilius von Caesarea und das *Homoousios*."

is attacked repeatedly in the *Apology*,[70] yet is not quite fair to claim that Eunomius thought that the Son was entirely unlike the Ingenerate, for it appears in the summary of his teaching in Philostorgius that he preferred the formula ὅμοιος κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.[71] In point of fact, Basil's statements can only be fully understood in the context of this earlier debate, as he takes up the "similar in substance" argument of the Homoiousians and develops the notion of three hypostases in the direction of Athanasian emphases on the closer, more organic relationship which involves identity of οὐσία. Behind the formation of the Homoiousian party, one can trace a line of development of thought seeking to adapt the worrisome concept of consubstantiality towards a proper reference of predicates to both Father and Son, as in the letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to his diocese explaining his acceptance of the Nicene Creed: παραστατικὸν δὲ εἶναι τὸ "ὁμοιούσιον τῷ πατρὶ" τοῦ μηδεμίαν ἐμφέρειαν πρὸς τὰ γενητὰ κτίσματα τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φέρειν, μόνῳ δὲ τῷ πατρὶ τῷ γεγεννηκότι κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀφωμοιῶσθαι καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἐξ ἑτέρας τινὸς ὑποστάσεώς τε καὶ οὐσίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πατρός. "The 'homoousios with the Father' is indicative that the Son of God bears no likeness with generate creatures, but is similar in every manner only to the Father who generated him and is not from some other hypostasis and substance, but from the Father."[72]

In effect, Eunomius is driving Basil towards a notion of a shared definition of substance, away from the similarity of hierarchically ranked hypostases, and hence to a notion of a class-relation of persons. It is impossible not to find this seeping through to the surface on occasion in Basil's writings, for example in the suspiciously Aristotelian statement, with its implication of substance-classification, that "substance is not said to be more or less than substance." This recalls Aristotle's statement in the *Categories* that δοκεῖ δὲ ἡ οὐσία μὴ ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον . . . ἀλλ' ὅτι ἑκάστη οὐσία τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐστίν, οὐ λέγεται μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον.[73] It appears that Basil is not slow to appropriate this Aristotelian concept, when he replies to the contention of Eunomius that *John* 14.28 implies that the Father is greater (μείζων) than the Son in essence, that ὅλως δὲ οὐσία οὐσίας, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν σοφίαν, μείζων καὶ ἐλάττων οὐ λέγεται.[74] This is just the sort of edge to Basil's

---

[70] Eunomius, *Ap.* 11.6-9; 18.12-13; 20.9-10; 24.26 (cited by Vaggione, 9).

[71] Philostorgius, *HE* 6.1 (GCS 70.15-22).

[72] Eusebius, *ap.* Athanasius, *Decr.* 33.13 (Opitz, 30.32-35).

[73] Aristotle, *Cat.* 3b33-37, similarly 4a8-9.

[74] Basil, *Eun.* 1.25, 34-35 (SC 299: 262).

thought that Hübner ignores, for he seems to confuse Basil's dislike of abstract notions of substance "above" the hypostases with the concept of a shared class to which Father, Son, and Holy Spirit belong on the basis of common predicates of being as well as a shared substrate. In fact, as Stead and others have pointed out, the notion of perfect likeness between persons as members of the same class is even present (to a limited extent, which requires careful qualification) in Athanasius, although it is far from the center of his trinitarian thought.[75]

In response to Eunomius, Basil heightens over his predecessors in the East the sense in which the persons enjoy full membership in a class of divinity. In his thought, not only are the Father and the Son comparable, but the properties (including even goodness and divinity in *Ep.* 214 cited above) are shared to an equal degree, although he does not emphasize the closeness and mutuality implied in Athanasius" concept of the unity of attributes (apprehensive of Sabellianism, as a good Origenist), which has been ably evaluated by Peter Widdicombe.[76] Of course, Basil does not talk about *every* term that could be used to characterize one hypostasis or the other, such as generateness or fatherhood, for these would not be elements in the common definition of οὐσία. These special terms of distinction serve a different purpose; at this point it is most important to show that neither these properties, nor for that matter any other property of the hypostases, make up a "fundamental principle" or "proper quality" of substance as Eunomius would have it, for Basil thinks that there is no such thing for substances earthly or divine.

At this point, the conclusion may be drawn that the "rational account" of the being (τὸ εἶναι) or substance of God is an important traditional element which Basil takes up in his doctrine of οὐσία. It is worth noting that this would make good sense to an Aristotelian, for whom the notions of genera and species are naturally associated with definition,[77] while the Stoics would prefer to posit a λόγος only with respect to uniquely qualified particulars.[78] Although Basil's grounding of divine unity in ὁ τῆς οὐσίας λόγος

---

[75] Stead, *Divine Substance*, 264-265.

[76] Peter Widdicombe, *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 203-205.

[77] *E.g.* Aristotle, *Cat.* 1a1-12, 2a11-27, 2a34-2b1; Porphyry, *In Cat.* 60.15-21 and 68.12-27 (Busse).

[78] This is clear from two similar passages in Simplicius, where he takes up the question of the constitution of individuals. (*In De An.* 217.34-218.2 (Hayduck) = FDS 846) εἴ γε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν συνθέτων τὸ ἀτομωθὲν ὑπάρχει εἶδος, καθ' ὅ ἰδίως παρὰ τοῖς ἐκ τῆς Στοᾶς

shows a basic similarity to what one finds in books four and five of the *Contra Eunomium* (probably, as Risch contends, written by Apollinarius), Basil does not ascribe importance as this theologian does to the relationship of begetting as such in his conception of a concretely existing τὸ κοινόν.[79] Risch argues that in this connection this theologian is using a conceptuality which largely matches that of Porphyry, while his notion that a univocal divine activity has the same λόγος τῆς οὐσίας while differing in its τρόπος is compared to the philosophy of one tractate of Plotinus (*Enneads* I.2).[80] Similar to Basil, he emphasizes a communication of predicates (though his communication of ἰδιώματα is certainly nowhere in Basil), but in his thought they must follow from the divine ἐνεργείαι, yielding predicates such as goodness and creativity.

With a more complete and accurate account of Basil's understanding of οὐσία in mind, the evaluation of a distinctively Stoic conception of οὐσία in Hübner's argument can be taken up once again, beginning with Christopher Stead's three points of critique of the argument that Gregory and Basil based their thought on different philosophical schools.[81] Two of these are related and are (surprisingly) weak: (1) In the important passage discussed by Hübner (*Sp. Sanct.* 17, 41.6-21) Basil disparages the theories

---

λέγεται ποιόν, ὃ καὶ ἀθρόως ἐπιγίνεται καὶ αὖ ἀπογίνεται καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν παντὶ τῷ τοῦ συνθέτου βίῳ διαμένει, καίτοι τῶν μορίων ἄλλων ἄλλοτε γιγνομένων τε καὶ φθειρομένων. (*In Cat.* 140.25-31 (Kalbfleisch) = FDS 846A) ὃ καὶ ἐν ταῖς μεταβολαῖς ὑπομένει καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄχρι τέλους γνωρίζεται· περὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐναργῶν ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν καὶ ἀμφισβητουμένων. On the different notions of definition (ὅρος) in Aristotle and Chrysippus, there is an excellent text at Sch. in Dionys. Thr. 107.1-6 (Uhlig) = FDS 627 = SVF 2.226.

[79] As has been pointed out, this is evident from the correspondence between Basil and Apollinarius. As Risch says (*Pseudo-Basilius*, 33), "Die Homoousie besteht also nicht darin, daß die vielen Einzelwesen durch eine bloße Gattungsform identifiziert werden, sondern daß sie durch Zeugung aus ihrer realen Gattungseinheit mit dieser das Selbe, nämlich ihre Einheit, in Andersheit sind. Dieses Konzept ist im bereits erwähnten Brief 362 dargelegt."

[80] Risch, *Pseudo-Basilius*, 34-35.

[81] Stead, "Individual Personality," 178-180. In an earlier article, Stead, "'Homoousios' dans la Pensée de Saint Athanase," *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974): 231-253 at 232 interprets Basil's formulation of "one essence, three hypostases" straightforwardly along the lines of Aristotelian primary and secondary substance. This view results in a one-sided understanding of Basil's trinitarian thought: "A partir de là, on pouvait expliquer la formule 'trois hypostases, une essence (*ousia*)' en vertu du fait familier de trois hommes, membres d'une même espèce."

of the philosophers that he has just set forth, and (2) "there was no need for him to consult them, since he could have picked up a nodding acquaintance with such schemes from authors such as Philo (*Agr.* 139) or Maximus who no more claimed specialized knowledge than did Basil himself." Aside from the inaccurate estimation of Basil's knowledge of dialectic, there is no particularly good reason to think that Basil had read or was influenced by this bit of Philo (which is quite different from the schemas of Basil and Gregory anyway) or the oration of Maximus of Tyre which he cites[82] (although Basil may well have been familiar with it), while it is much more plausible to point as Hübner does to Porphyry and the Stoic passages from Diogenes Laertius and Simplicius.[83] Stead's best point is "that there were differences among professional philosophers, not only between the schools, but *within* the schools," but he does not say in more detail how this presents difficulties for Hübner's thesis.

Rather, a more substantial mistake that Hübner makes with regard to Basil and Stoicism is that he misunderstands one aspect of the standard logical system of the Stoics, assuming that it makes sense to posit a qualified substrate for common substance, and not only for particulars. This problem emerges when Hübner discusses *Eun.* 2.28, where Basil is trying to articulate the doctrine of τὰ ἰδιώματα in a simple undivided divine substance;[84] Basil uses the differences forming classes of a single underlying οὐσία as an illustration but of course these do not yield individuals, and it is unwarranted to find from this passage a cryptic reference to individuals by means of the κοινῶς ποιόν. By contrast, the other passage adduced here (*Eun.* 2.19) represents the typical Stoic view that all corporeal things are uniquely qualified as individuated from unqualified οὐσία, and could easily be considered consubstantial, but not as parts of a common yet qualified substrate. More clearly, the problem appears when Hübner turns to the passages *Eun.* 2.4 and 1.15.[85] In *Eun.* 2.4, Basil has one οὐσία for all men, who possess different names and thus unique characteristics, but the name of the individual does not signify the material substrate (τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον); if this is Stoic conceptuality, then it is either confused or heavily adapted,

---

[82] Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 11.8. This text and the text from Philo are quite similar to the series of divisions that one finds in Porphyry (*In Cat.* 101.7-12 (Busse)), and as such such be grouped together as distinct from the famous schema of the *Isagoge.*

[83] Simplicius, *In Cat.* 69.19-23 (Kalbfleisch) = FDS 321 = SVF 2.362; Diogenes Laertius 7.60-61 = SVF 1.65.

[84] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 473.

[85] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 474.

for the passage maintains that the substrate of all men features characteristics which are equally shared, which is impossible for the Stoics who can not ground what in Aristotelian terms are genera and species in a substance or substrate. That is, if Hübner has in mind the Stoic common quality (which must be purely conceptual as Rist argues) in his interpretation of these passages, then he is misled. On the other hand, it might well be possible to speak of Stoic terminology in an Aristotelian framework, as one finds in Porphyry, who represents the species "ὁ ἄνθρωπος" as κοινῶς ποιόν in his commentary on the *Categories*.[86]

To summarize the argument presented here, it is possible to see evidence in Basil of deeply ingrained habits of thought which he carries into his writings from his early training in Stoic dialectic. One outstanding example of this may be seen in his insistence that the οὐσία of God must have its being securely rooted in a hypostasis, while the Stoics would say that nothing can exist without the possession of οὐσία (their first category), as a qualified thing (ποιόν).[87] What one does not find in Basil is a doctrine of divine substance and persons which can support a consistent conceptuality derived from Stoic logic, as the difficulties outlined above demonstrate, nor can it be shown that Basil draws on this to the exclusion of Neoplatonic logic, such as one finds in Porphyry.[88] Taking up one prominent example

---

[86] Porphyry, *In Cat.* 81.16-18 (Busse). τὸ δὲ κατὰ κοινότητα τὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγεσθαι συμβεβηκότος ἐστὶ παραστατικὸν μᾶλλον ἢ οὐσίας, συμβεβηκότος δὲ οὐ τοῦ κυρίως ἀλλὰ τοῦ εἰκότος διαφορᾷ τινι.

[87] Rist, *Stoic Philosophy*, 165.

[88] The lack of coherence in Basil's terminology thoughout his works is a point which is central to Drecoll's arguments against Hübner's thesis, *Die Entwicklung*, 64 note 55, 67, 95 note 135, 323, and 327-329. Despite the irregularities, Drecoll argues for an οὐσία-Begriff which must be understood in light of the "aristotelisch-porphyrianischen Tradition" (322-328), with the principle of the unknowability of divine substance tacked on. This view, carefully nuanced as it is, would set aside the important advance represented by Hübner's equally exacting and detailed examination of the relevant texts. Unfortunately, both scholars tend to assume a sharp distinction between Aristotelian and Stoic logic, which by the fourth century had partly broken down; indeed Porphyry can be viewed as a watershed figure in this development. Drecoll bases much of his analysis on Porphyry's *Isagoge*, but in his quite helpful discussion (320-321 note 102) of the influence of Porphyry as commentator on the *Categories* says nothing about Stoic doctrines prominent in his longer commentary (in seven books) addressed to Gedaleius, attested by Simplicius (*In Cat.* 2.5-13 (Kalbfleisch) = Smith 45T). More telling, perhaps, is the fact that Drecoll does not seem to take into account Porphyry's extant shorter commentary (missing from his Register, *s.* Porphyrios), which as argued here sheds some light on the blend of Peripatetic and Stoic concepts that one finds in Basil.

of this, one finds Hübner conceding that both Porphyry and Basil have οὐσία as the highest genus, but he rejects "eine schlichte Übernahme der tabula logica des Porphyrius in de spiritu sancto c. 17," despite striking similarities, primarily on the grounds that Porphyry omits the bottom of the series of εἴδη by halting at the species "man" and then proceeding to individuals.[89] In fact, on the level of individuals Porphyry maintains that individuals are conjunctions of qualities which cannot be duplicated (ἰδιοτήτων ἄθροισμα),[90] and moreover in the *Isagoge* he never claims to be explicating pure and unmixed Aristotelian logic. It is justified to say that Basil is somewhere in between Stoic and Aristotelian doctrines of substance, while his mind is also guided on these matters by his theological predecessors and contemporaries.[91]

King's College London, Department of Theology and Religious Studies

[89] Hübner, *op. cit.*, 471-472. Porphyry's Tree of Being is found at *Is.* 2a13-25 (4.21-5.1 (Busse)), and of course this logical table and the rules that govern it are reflected in his commentary on the *Categories, e.g.* 83.25-34 (Busse).

[90] Porphyry, *Is.* 2b48-3a6 (7.21-23 (Busse)). A.C. Lloyd comments on this passage in Porphyry ("Neo-platonic logic and Aristotelian logic-II," 158-159), "There are other passages [in SVF], which Prantl might have quoted, to shew that it was definitely a Stoic term. At the same time the description of sensible individuals as bundles of properties is the theory of Plotinus himself (VI 3,8). In Porphyry it has a double motive. Whether or not he was conscious of it, it is the natural conclusion of a logic that concerns itself only with predicates as classes. . . . But it is also, as it was in Plotinus, pure Platonism. For despite the fact that the particular had somehow to be the logical subject, it could never for a Platonist be a substance. In fact ἄθροισμα is originally the term applied by Plato to sensible particulars in a passage which is denying that these are substances or even genuine subjects (*Theaet.* 157b-c). The Stoic ἰδίως ποιόν (the term is common among Neoplatonists) were simply assimilated to this point of view."

[91] This paper has benefited from criticisms and suggestions from my dissertation advisor, Graham Gould, as well as Anthony Meredith, John Zizioulas, and R.W. Sharples.

LE PASSAGE DU PREMIER ADAM AU SECOND ADAM COMME EXPRESSION DU SALUT CHEZ IRÉNÉE DE LYON[1]

PAR

J. FANTINO

Les Pères ont approfondi leur compréhension du salut en méditant sur le mystère du Christ Jésus. Celui-ci est Sauveur par ce qu'il fait et par ce qu'il est. On retrouve cette perspective chez Irénée.[2] Elle est notamment exprimée sous la figure du Christ récapitulateur de toute l'économie du salut.[3] La récapitulation exprime la réalisation de l'économie par et dans le Christ Jésus, Dieu et homme.[4] Comme l'économie a pour but la perfection de l'être humain et de toute la création, la récapitulation consiste donc principalement à porter l'être humain et la création à leur accomplissement.[5] L'économie est alors passage de l'imperfection à la perfection, de l'inachèvement à l'achèvement, passage d'un commencement à une fin. Ce passage commande toute la compréhension irénéenne de l'économie et, en particulier, la place du péché au sein de cette économie. L'étude qui suit traite de ce passage comme étant celui du premier Adam au nouvel Adam, Jésus Christ, de la condition psychique du premier à la condition spirituelle du second. Pour cela la réflexion montre d'abord comment Irénée reprend le parallèle introduit par Paul entre Adam et le Christ Jésus pour expliciter l'économie du salut comme passage du psychique au spirituel effectué par

---

[1] Ce texte est le développement d'une communication faite lors de la *XIIth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Oxford, 21-26 août 1995.

[2] Voir, par exemple, *Haer* 5, pr-5,1,1.

[3] Sur la récapitulation, on pourra consulter A. Houssiau, *La christologie de saint Irénée*, Louvain, Gembloux, 1955; G. Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation: a Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*, London, Edinburgh, 1959; A. Benoît, *S. Irénée, introduction à l'étude de sa théologie*, Paris, 1960; J. Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée*, Paris, 1994.

[4] Y. de Andia, *Homo vivens, incorruptibilité et divinisation de l'homme selon Irénée de Lyon*, Paris, 1986, p. 62.

[5] Voir en particulier A. Houssiau, *La christologie de S. Irénée, op. cit.*, p. 227s.; J. Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée, op. cit.*, pp. 243-247. Dans cette perspective la récapitulation comporte aussi le rassemblement du genre humain en un seul peuple et la libération du péché, de la mort et de Satan; voir Y. de Andia, *Homo vivens, op. cit.*, pp. 114-116; J. Fantino, ib.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

le Christ. Dans cette perspective se pose la question de la place du péché par rapport à l'économie. C'est pourquoi l'étude poursuit en examinant la relation entre péché et condition psychique.

Le parallèle entre le premier Adam et le dernier Adam, Jésus Christ, est introduit dans la réflexion chrétienne par Paul en deux textes: *1Co* 15, 20-21 et 42-48; *Rm* 5,12-21. Selon eux le péché et la mort sont entrés dans le monde par Adam, la vie par Jésus Christ. Il s'agit bien sûr de la vie nouvelle qu'est la résurrection, comme l'indique le sujet de *1Co* 15 qui porte précisément sur la résurrection. Paul rappelle que la foi en la résurrection des morts est fondée sur la foi en la résurrection du Christ Jésus. Par conséquent, il existe une résurrection corporelle pour les hommes et Paul aborde en particulier la question du corps des ressuscités (*1Co* 15,42-48). Partant du présupposé de la resurrection du Christ, Paul veut essentiellement montrer que le corps des ressuscités est un corps spirituel différent du corps psychique, et donc qu'il existe un corps spirituel qui résulte de la transformation du corps psychique. Paul interprète à cet effet le passage de la Genèse où figure le récit de la création de l'homme par Dieu: *Dieu modela l'homme à partir du limon de la terre, il insuffla dans sa face un souffle de vie et l'homme devint une âme vivante* (*Gn* 2,7).[6] Paul développe son interprétation en mettant en évidence l'antithèse entre le type de vie que possède et transmet Adam d'un côté et le Christ Jésus d'un autre. En effet, Adam est psychique, mais le Christ ressuscité vit corporellement de l'Esprit Saint:

> Semé corps psychique, il ressuscite corps spirituel. S'il y a un corps psychique, il y a aussi un corps spirituel. C'est ainsi qu'il est écrit: le premier homme Adam fut une âme vivante, le dernier Adam est un esprit donnant la vie. Mais, ce qui est premier, c'est le psychique, pas le spirituel; ensuite vient le spirituel (*1Co* 15,44-46).

D'abord psychique, ensuite spirituel

Irénée reprend *1Co* 15, mais en déplaçant la perspective.[7] A la différence de Paul Irénée n'est pas intéressé à montrer que le corps des ressuscités

---

[6] Le texte cité correspond à la version habituelle de la Septante. Irénée lit pour ce passage une version légèrement différente: Dieu prit du limon de la terre, modela l'homme etc. Voir J. Fantino, *L'homme, image de Dieu chez saint Irénée de Lyon*, Paris, 1986, p. 226, n. 464. Sur ce texte de Paul, voir par exemple C. Senft, *La première Épitre de saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, Genève, 1990, pp. 204-210; J. Murphy – O'Connor, *The first Letter to the Corinthians*, in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 1991, pp. 812-814.

[7] Voir *Haer* 3,22,3; 5,1,3; 5,12,1-3. Sur le commentaire de *1Co* 15 par Irénée, voir

est un corps spirituel différent du corps psychique. Ses adversaires gnostiques admettent en effet l'existence des deux. Ce qui intéresse essentiellement Irénée en *1Co* 15,44-46 c'est l'ordre révélé par le texte paulinien, à savoir le passage du psychique au spirituel. Cet ordre a pour conséquence de manifester que le spirituel existe à la fin et non au commencement, contrairement aux affirmations gnostiques. Il y a d'abord l'homme psychique et ensuite l'homme spirituel. D'abord le premier Adam, ensuite le dernier Adam:

> Il fallait que l'homme fut d'abord modelé, qu'après avoir été modelé il reçût une âme, et qu'ensuite seulement il reçût la communion de l'Esprit. C'est pourquoi aussi "le premier Adam a été fait âme vivante, mais le second Adam a été fait Esprit vivifiant." De même donc que celui qui avait été fait âme vivante, en inclinant vers le mal, a perdu la vie, ainsi ce même homme, en revenant au bien et en recevant l'Esprit vivifiant, retrouvera la vie (*Haer* 5,12,2).

Ainsi, contrairement aux doctrines gnostiques, l'homme créé au commencement n'est pas spirituel, mais psychique.[8] Adam avait bien en lui un début de présence de l'Esprit, qu'il perdit suite à la transgression du commandement divin (*Haer* 3,23,5). C'est d'ailleurs ce que rappelle la fin de la citation précédente par sa dissymétrie. Si faire le mal procure la mort, faire le bien ne donne pas pour autant la vie, il faut en plus l'Esprit Saint. Nous reviendrons plus loin sur la transgression d'Adam et ses conséquences. Pour l'instant retenons que la vie possédée par Adam à sa création n'était pas à strictement parler une vie spirituelle. Adam n'était donc pas spirituel. En effet, pour Irénée, être spirituel c'est vivre de l'Esprit de Dieu car *c'est notre substance, c'est-à-dire le composé d'âme et de chair, qui, en recevant l'Esprit de Dieu, constitue l'homme spirituel* (*Haer* 5,8,2).

Le principe de vie du premier Adam est psychique. C'est le souffle de vie ou âme[9] qui est incapable de donner indéfiniment la vie à l'homme (*Haer* 5,12,1). Mais, le principe de vie du dernier Adam est spirituel, c'est l'Esprit de Dieu. C'est ainsi qu'Irénée commente le texte paulinien de *1Co* 15 cité plus haut montrant bien que le passage de la condition psychique à la condition spirituelle correspond à un véritable changement du mode d'existence de l'être humain. L'homme psychique vit par son âme, l'homme spirituel par l'Esprit Saint:

A. Orbe, *Teología de san Ireneo.* Comentario al Libro V del "adversus Haereses," Madrid, t. 1, 1985, pp. 554-565.

[8] Voir Orbe, *Teología de san Ireneo, op. cit.*, t. 1, p. 555.

[9] Irénée identifie l'âme au souffle de vie de Gn 2,7. Voir, par exemple, *Haer* 5,12,2; 5,14,4 et Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée, op. cit.*, p. 331 et n. 135.

> Semée corps psychique, (la chair) ressuscitera corps spirituel. Sans aucun doute possible, l'Apôtre nous apprend par là que ce n'est ni de l'âme ni de l'Esprit qu'il parle, mais des corps morts. Tels sont bien en effet les corps psychiques, c'est-à-dire participant à une âme: lorsqu'ils la perdent, ils meurent; puis, ressuscitant par l'Esprit, ils deviennent des corps spirituels, afin de posséder, par l'Esprit, une vie qui demeure à jamais (*Haer* 5,7,2).

Cet extrait montre que ressusciter et vivre de l'Esprit Saint marque l'accomplissement de l'économie du salut. On voit donc que, pour Irénée, le salut consiste à passer de la condition psychique du premier Adam à la condition spirituelle du nouvel Adam, Jésus Christ.[10] C'est ainsi qu'il comprend *1Co* 15,22: *comme tous meurent en Adam, en Christ tous recevront la vie.* En effet, affirme Irénée, *c'est la chair que le Seigneur est venue rendre à la vie, afin que, comme nous mourons tous en Adam parce que psychiques, nous vivions tous dans le Christ parce que spirituels, après avoir rejeté, non l'ouvrage modelé par Dieu, mais les convoitises de la chair, et avoir reçu l'Esprit Saint* (*Haer* 5,12,3).

Les termes psychique et spirituel ne figurent pas en *1Co* 15,22. Irénée les ajoute, car il interpète ce texte en fonction du passage du psychique au spirituel décrit par Paul un peu plus loin en *1Co* 15,44-46. Ce passage n'est pas l'œuvre de l'être humain mais du Créateur (*Haer* 5,13,3), et plus précisément du Verbe incarné, le Christ Jésus, qui donne l'Esprit Saint aux hommes.[11] Mais, le don de l'Esprit permet d'autre part de rejeter les convoitises, ou plus exactement la soumission aux convoitises, conséquence du péché, tout comme la mort. En effet, dans d'autres textes, Irénée affirme à la suite des Ecritures que la mort est la conséquence de la transgression d'Adam.[12] Comment concilier les deux affirmations qu'Irénée trouve dans les Ecritures, en particulier chez Paul? D'une part, les hommes sont soumis à la mort parce qu'Adam a désobéi au commandement de Dieu (*1Co* 15,22; *Rm* 5,12s). D'autre part, ils meurent en Adam parce que psychiques, puisque la résurrection est la transformation du psychique en spirituel (*1Co* 15,44-46). La condition psychique d'Adam est-elle dépendante du péché? Nous avons vu que, même si Adam avait un début de vie spirituelle avant sa transgression, sa condition n'était pas pour autant spirituelle.

En effet, le composé humain, corps et âme, est mortel. C'est pourquoi Irénée affirme que l'homme est mortel par nature (*Haer* 5,3,1), parce que l'âme est incapable de donner indéfiniment la vie au corps (*Haer* 5,12,2). Mais, en même temps, l'être humain est capable de recevoir l'incorrup-

---

[10] Voir Fantino, *L'homme image de Dieu, op. cit.*, pp. 128-134.

[11] Cf., par exemple, *Haer* 5,12,2; 5,13,4.

[12] Voir par exemple *Haer* 3,23,5-7 et *Dem* 31.

tibilité, c'est-à-dire de passer de la condition psychique du premier Adam à la condition spirituelle du dernier Adam. C'est ce passage qu'est venu accomplir le Christ Jésus, le dernier Adam qui communique l'Esprit Saint parce qu'il est le Verbe de Dieu fait homme. Cette remarque éclaire d'un jour nouveau les affirmations d'Irénée. C'est en tant qu'homme et Dieu que le Christ Jésus accomplit en effet le salut, c'est-à-dire le passage de la condition psychique à la condition spirituelle. Car, les conditions psychique et spirituelle qui expriment le commencement et la fin de l'économie sont celles de personnes précises qui ne situent pas au même niveau. Adam est le premier homme et de ce fait appartient à la création. Jésus est le Fils de Dieu fait homme, il unit en lui l'incréé et le créé et agit en tant qu'homme et Dieu. Le passage de la condition psychique à la condition spirituelle est par conséquent le résultat de l'incarnation du Fils et de son agir.

C'est ce que le Christ manifeste, en effectuant le passage et en révélant qu'il est lui-même l'image dont Adam n'était que l'ébauche. C'est aussi selon cette trame que doit être située la compréhension de la transgression d'Adam et de ses conséquences. Ces trois points sont repris successivement.

Le Christ, maître d'œuvre du passage

Le passage de la condition psychique à la condition spirituelle n'est pas déterminé par le péché, mais par l'incarnation du Fils de Dieu. Irénée voit en effet dans la guérison de l'aveugle-né rapportée par l'évangile de Jean (*Jn* 9) la figure de l'accomplissement du salut par le Verbe incarné. Aussi commente-t-il longuement cet épisode de l'évangile (*Haer* 5,15,2-5,16,2).

Dans un premier temps il rappelle que la condition de l'aveugle-né n'est pas due au péché, comme Jésus lui-même l'affirme dans le texte (*Jn* 9,3 cité en *Haer* 5,15,2). Il distingue soigneusement les maladies qui sont conséquences du péché du cas de cet aveugle qui est dans cet état pour manifester les œuvres de Dieu (ib.). Selon Irénée ces œuvres constituent l'acte créateur lui-même. Il remarque en effet que les gestes accomplis par Jésus pour guérir l'aveugle et rapportés en *Jn* 9,6 sont précisément ceux que le Créateur effectua pour créer Adam:

> ces œuvres de Dieu sont le modelage de l'homme, car c'est bien par un acte que Dieu avait effectué ce modelage, selon ce que dit l'Ecriture: "Et Dieu prit du limon de la terre, et il modela l'homme (*Gn* 2,7)." C'est pour cela que le Seigneur cracha à terre, fit de la boue et en enduisit les yeux de l'aveugle, montrant par là de quelle façon avait eu lieu le modelage originel et [. . .] manifestant la Main de Dieu par laquelle l'homme avait été modelé à partir du limon. Car ce que le Verbe Artisan avait omis de modeler dans le sein

maternel, il l'accomplit au grand jour "afin que les œuvres de Dieu soient manifestées en lui (*Jn* 9,6)" (*Haer* 5,15,2).

Mais, l'action du Verbe incarné ne se limite pas à rendre la vue à l'aveugle. Le Verbe achève en effet le modelage qui correspond à la condition psychique. En envoyant l'aveugle se laver dans la piscine de Siloé, acte qui figure le baptême procurant l'Esprit, Jésus fait accéder l'aveugle guéri à la condition spirituelle (*Haer* 5,15,3). La guérison de l'aveugle est ainsi pour Irénée le symbole du salut comme achèvement de la création, le symbole du passage de la condition première à la condition nouvelle apportée par le Christ Jésus.[13] Il s'agit en effet d'achever de modeler l'homme à l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu.[14]

L'homme à l'image et à la ressemblance du Christ Jésus

Le thème de l'homme à l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu est central dans l'anthropologie irénéenne et constitue une pièce essentielle de l'arsenal antignostique. Les notions d'image et de ressemblance ont été étudiées chez Irénée[15] et elles sont reprises ici seulement dans la perspective de la réalisation du dessein de Dieu qu'est l'économie et dont Irénée trouve un résumé dans l'affirmation de la Genèse: *Faisons l'homme à notre image et à notre ressemblance* (*Gn* 1,26).

Tout d'abord, pour Irénée, l'image est distincte de la ressemblance. Cette dernière exprime la présence de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme, présence qui continue le modelage de l'être humain pour le rendre plus ressemblant à l'image de Dieu qu'est le Christ Jésus, le Fils incarné (*Haer* 4,39,2-3). Pour Irénée, l'image implique corporéité et visibilité.[16] L'image suppose en effet un substrat matériel et une forme qui exprime la ressemblance au modèle.

---

[13] Voir Orbe, *Teología de san Ireneo, op. cit.*, t. 2, 1987, pp. 57-61.

[14] Dans son commentaire de *Jn* 9 Irénée insiste surtout sur le rôle du Verbe, mais le modelage implique aussi le Père et l'Esprit. Ainsi, dans un autre texte, Irénée, reprenant l'image de l'artisan, montre le Père qui modèle l'homme par sa Main qui est le Verbe et grâce à l'Eau qui est l'Esprit rendant l'homme malléable (*Haer* 4,39,2). Sur l'appellation de Main, voir J. Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée, op. cit.*, pp. 306-309.

[15] Voir J. Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of saint Irenaeus*, London, 1948, pp. 200-213; G. Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation*, London-Edinburgh, 1959, p. 201s; A. Orbe, *Antropología de san Ireneo*, Madrid, 1969, pp. 89-148; id., *Teología de san Ireneo, op. cit.*, t. 1, pp. 266-304; J. Fantino, *L'homme image de Dieu, op. cit.*, spécialement pp. 121-143 et 155-170.

[16] L'image suppose un substrat matériel et une forme; voir Fantino, *L'homme image de Dieu, op. cit.*, pp. 82-89; Irénée de Lyon, *Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, édition d'A. Rousseau (Sources Chrétiennes, 406), Paris, 1995, p. 367.

Les substrats du modèle et de la copie peuvent être différents, mais ils doivent être matériels pour avoir une forme. D'où la critique radicale de la doctrine gnostique concernant l'image.

Pour les gnostiques, en effet, la notion d'image exprime une relation hiérarchique entre deux êtres, le modèle ayant une antériorité et donc une supériorité ontologique sur l'image. Ce type de relation existe entre des êtres de substances diffèrentes. Un être psychique ou matériel peut ainsi être image d'un être spirituel. Des relations de ce type existent aussi entre créatures spirituelles. C'est un des traits qui permet d'expliciter la structure du Plérôme.

Pour Irénée, il n'existe pas d'image spirituelle sans substrat matériel. Par conséquent le Fils, en tant que Fils, n'est pas image de Dieu. L'image de Dieu dans l'être humain est le Fils incarné en qui on voit le Père (*Haer* 4,6,6).

Par son incarnation le Verbe rend l'image visible et stabilise le don de l'Esprit qui porte la ressemblance à sa perfection. Celle-ci fut perdue par Adam. Mais, Irénée insiste sur l'ébauche qu'elle était en Adam par rapport à celle que le Christ Jésus possède et transmet. En Adam la ressemblance n'était qu'un commencement, ce qui fait partie de la condition d'enfance d'Adam.[17] Avec le Christ la ressemblance devient greffe de l'Esprit, c'est-à-dire présence permanente. La différence entre les deux Adam tient dans le fait que le second est le Fils de Dieu fait homme, archétype de l'être humain, archétype d'Adam.

Autrement dit, la perte de la ressemblance ou, ce qui revient au même, la perte de l'Esprit est due à ce que le Verbe n'était pas encore venu dans la chair, *car dans les temps antérieurs, on disait bien que l'homme avait été fait à l'image de Dieu, mais cela n'apparaissait pas, car le Verbe était encore invisible, lui à l'image de qui l'homme avait été fait: c'est d'ailleurs pour ce motif que la ressemblance s'était facilement perdue* (*Haer* 5,16,2).

Au terme de sa vie terrestre, c'est-à-dire à la Pentecôte, le Christ Jésus procure aux hommes l'Esprit *de manière stable, en rendant l'homme pleinement semblable au Père invisible par le moyen du Verbe dorénavant visible* (ib.).

Adam est créé à l'image du Fils qui doit s'incarner (*Haer* 5,16,2). L'extrait précédent enseigne que l'image de Dieu n'était pas visible dans l'être

[17] Voir Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of saint Irenaeus, op. cit.*, p. 213s; A. Luneau, *L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Eglise*, Paris, 1964, p. 96; Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée, op. cit.*, pp. 340-342 et n. 155. Nous verrons plus loin un autre aspect de cette condition: l'immaturité de la connaissance et de la délibération.

humain, non pas à cause du péché, mais parce que le modèle n'était pas encore apparu, que le Fils de Dieu ne s'était pas encore incarné. La visibilité de l'image de Dieu est associée à l'incarnation (*Haer* 4,6,6), car *l'image de Dieu, c'est le Fils à l'image duquel l'homme fut fait. Et, c'est pourquoi, dans les derniers temps, il est apparu afin de montrer que l'image était semblable à lui-même* (*Dem* 22).[18]

C'est dans la ligne de ce que procure le Christ Jésus qu'il faut situer la question du rapport entre la condition psychique d'Adam et le péché. La condition spirituelle que communique le Christ est une perfection à partir de la condition première d'Adam avant la transgression. Mais, le mal est second, il est utilisé par Dieu pour mener à l'accomplissement.[19]

Le passage du premier au second Adam et le péché

L'être humain n'est pas à l'origine du péché, c'est Satan, désigné comme l'Apostasie. Tel est l'enseignement constant d'Irénée.[20] Satan et ses anges avaient en charge le monde terrestre. Il en était l'intendant, mais non le maître. Ce monde était destiné à l'homme (*Dem* 11). Par jalousie Satan a provoqué la transgression d'Adam et Eve, faisant ainsi entrer le mal et la mort dans le monde. Cette conception de l'origine du mal et du péché provient du judaïsme de la fin du second Temple.[21] Ainsi, c'est Satan qui entraîne Adam dans la transgression, à partir de laquelle la condition psy-

---

[18] Je suis la traduction de L. Froidevaux (Sources chrétiennes, 62) et de tous les éditeurs antérieurs à Rousseau. Elle est l'écho fidèle de *Haer* 5,16,2. Rousseau traduit: *il est apparu afin de rendre l'image* etc. Les explications données à cette traduction ne sont guère convaincantes (cf. Rousseau, id., C. 22, n. 3, pp. 257-261). Rousseau lie le fait que l'image n'était pas visible au péché, comme le prouve le début de sa longue note: *le Fils est apparu afin de rendre (à nouveau) semblable à lui-même l'image (défigurée par le péché).* Or, les textes d'Irénée disent au contraire que l'image de Dieu en l'être humain n'était pas visible parce que le Fils n'était pas encore incarné (*Haer* 5,16,2). Voir à ce sujet les remarques de G. Pelland, "Une étape importante des études irénéennes," *Gregorianum* 78, 1997, pp. 140-141.

[19] Voir Luneau, *L'histoire du salut, op. cit.*, pp. 99-101.

[20] Voir, par exemple, *Haer* 4,41; 5,21 et *Dem* 16.

[21] Voir D.R. Schultz, "The Origin of Sin in Irenaeus and Jewish Pseudepigraphical Literature," *VC* 32, 1978, pp. 161-190; sur la diversité des conceptions, en particulier sur le rôle d'Adam, voir J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism*, Sheffield, 1988; G.H. Baudry, "Le péché originel dans les écrits de Qoumrân," *Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses* 49, 1992, pp. 7-23; "Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament," ib., pp. 163-192; "Le péché originel chez Philon d'Alexandrie," *Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses* 50, 1993, pp. 99-115.

chique de l'être humain est marquée par la soumission au péché, à la mort et à Satan. La condition spirituelle apportée par le Christ est alors présentée comme affranchissement de cet esclavage. Tous les hommes sont depuis Adam dans une condition de péché et de mort; tous reçoivent la vie par le Christ Jésus et en lui. C'est dans la ligne du salut compris comme passage de la condition psychique de désobéissance à la condition spirituelle d'obéissance qu'Irénée interprète *Rm* 5:

> Car, de même que, "par la désobéissance d'un seul homme" qui fut, le premier, modelé à partir d'une terre vierge, "beaucoup ont été constitués pécheurs" et ont perdu la vie, ainsi fallait-il que, "par l'obéissance d'un seul homme" qui est, le premier, né de la Vierge, "beaucoup soient justifiés" et reçoivent le salut (*Haer* 3,18,7).

Quelle relation peut-il exister entre cette affirmation et la perspective précédente qui voit le salut comme passage de la condition psychique à la condition spirituelle? Pour Irénée, la réponse est dans l'Evangile où Jésus lui-même donne un signe de ce mystère, c'est le signe de Jonas.[22] Ainsi, l'interprétation du texte de la lettre aux Romains passe par la compréhension du signe de Jonas.[23]

Jonas est la figure de l'humanité enfermée, puis sauvée. En effet, de même que Jonas, enfermé dans le monstre marin, fut sauvé par la miséricorde de Dieu, de même l'humanité, engloutie dans le monstre qu'est la mort, est sauvée par le Christ Jésus:

> Dieu a permis que Jonas fût englouti par le monstre marin, non pour qu'il disparût et périt totalement, mais pour qu'après avoir été rejeté par le monstre il fût plus soumis à Dieu et le glorifiât davantage [. . .] De la même manière, dès le commencement, Dieu a permis que l'homme fût englouti par le grand monstre, auteur de la transgression, non pour qu'il disparût et périt totalement, mais parce que Dieu préparait à l'avance l'acquisition du salut qu'a effectuée le Verbe, par le moyen du signe de Jonas (*Haer* 3,20,1).

Irénée reprend l'enseignement paulinien de *Rm* 5, mais en insistant sur la notion d'enfermement. Par la désobéissance d'Adam tous les hommes sont enfermés dans le péché et la mort; par l'obéissance du Christ tous sont également enfermés, mais en vue d'être ouverts à la vie. Le salut est par conséquent, là aussi, considéré comme passage du premier Adam au second Adam, mais un passage qui est en même temps celui de la désobéissance à l'obéissance, de la mort à la vie, passage qu'Irénée trouve exprimé

---

[22] *Mt* 12,38-42 et *Lc* 11,29-32.

[23] Voir A. Orbe, "El signo de Jonás según san Ireneo," *Gregorianum* 77, 1996, 637-657.

dans un autre texte de Paul: *Dieu a enfermé tous les hommes dans la désobéissance pour faire à tous miséricorde* (*Rm* 11,32).[24] L'humanité enfermée dans la mort est sauvée par le Christ qui lui communique la vie de l'Esprit.

Nous avons vu que le transgresseur est en fait Satan qui conduit Adam et Eve à transgresser à leur tour. Irénée reprend cette doctrine judéochrétienne en l'adaptant à sa propre conception théologique de la création et de son devenir. Il distingue en effet dans la création deux mondes. Le premier est constitué des cieux, des puissances qui les habitent et des astres. Le second est le monde terrestre, sub-lunaire, situé sous le premier ciel.[25] Ces deux mondes sont soumis au changement, mais selon une modalité différente.[26] Pour les créatures célestes le changement intervient en profondeur et à un moment précis seulement: détermination des anges dans le bien ou le mal, transfiguration des astres à la fin des temps. Pour les créatures terrestres le changement est permanent. Les anges voient leur condition déterminée par le choix qu'ils font pour ou contre le dessein de Dieu. C'est cette capacité à se déterminer par rapport au dessein divin qui caractérise pour Irénée l'état "adulte," c'est-à-dire achevé, des anges. Et c'est pourquoi cette détermination est irrévocable. Il n'en est pas de même en revanche pour l'être humain: pour Adam qui a été créé enfant, c'est-à-dire dans l'incapacité de poser un choix mûrement réfléchi par rapport au dessein de Dieu. Il doit grandir pour pouvoir se déterminer librement. La transgression a précipité Adam et tout le genre humain sur un chemin parsemé d'épreuves. Mais, la détermination posée par Adam et Eve dans la transgression ne saurait être définitive, compte tenu de leur état d'enfance. C'est pourquoi Adam sera sauvé. C'est pourquoi aussi Dieu a introduit la mort comme limite au mal et au péché (*Haer* 3,23,6).

Dans cette perspective, la transgression d'Adam entraîne bien sûr pour le genre humain la soumission au péché et à la mort. Mais, et c'est un point essentiel à souligner, la condition d'Adam avant la transgression n'est pas, pour Irénée, identique à celle de Jésus. C'est ce qu'Irénée veut aussi

---

[24] Ce texte figure sur la liste de questions considérées par Irénée comme des exemples de recherche théologique légitime (*Haer* 1,10,3); sur cette liste et son contenu, voir J. Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée, op. cit.*, pp. 61-65.

[25] Sur la cosmologie d'Irénée, voir Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée, op. cit.*, p. 323s.

[26] Que le monde céleste soit lui aussi marqué par la temporalité et le changement est une différence caractéristique de la pensée d'Irénée par rapport aux conceptions cosmologiques communes de son époque; ib., pp. 326-328.

exprimer en parlant de la condition d'enfance d'Adam.[27] A la différence de la tradition théologique ultérieure, tant orientale qu'occidentale, Irénée ne considère pas Adam et Eve comme possesseurs d'une intelligence parfaitement éclairée ni d'une expérience morale suffisamment aguerrie. Ces deux caractéristiques doivent être acquises et correspondent à une croissance et, à une croissance coûteuse.[28] Si l'on compare la situation d'Adam et du Christ Jésus, on est conduit à distinguer la perfection, ou sainteté, d'Adam avant la transgression de la perfection de Jésus et des saints qui ont combattu contre le péché. Irénée ne pose pas explicitement cette distinction, mais elle est sous-jacente, à mon avis, à ses écrits et apparaît nettement quand on met en parallèle les situations d'Adam et de Jésus.

En fonction de ce qui précède, on comprend que le modelage de l'être humain à l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu implique l'accoutumance réciproque de l'homme à Dieu et de Dieu à l'homme. Par son incarnation, c'est-à-dire par ce qu'il est et par ce qu'il fait, Jésus, le Fils, habitue Dieu à être en communion avec l'être humain et l'être humain à être en communion avec Dieu.[29] L'accoutumance prépare l'accomplissement.[30]

Car, tel est bien le dessein de Dieu que les hommes apprennent à le connaître et à choisir de vivre avec lui, c'est-à-dire à lui obéir et à faire le bien:

> Dieu ayant usé de longanimité, l'homme a donc connu et le bien de l'obéissance et le mal de la désobéissance, afin que l'œil de son esprit, ayant acquis l'expérience de l'un et de l'autre, fasse choix du bien avec décision et ne soit ni paresseux ni négligent à l'égard du commandement de Dieu [. . .] Et c'est pourquoi (l'homme) a reçu une double faculté possédant la connaissance de l'un et de l'autre, afin de faire choix du bien en connaissance de cause. Cette connaissance du bien, comment aurait-il pu l'avoir, s'il avait ignoré son contraire? Car plus ferme et plus incontestable est la perception d'objets présents qu'une conjecture résultant d'une supposition. Car, de même que la langue acquiert par le goût l'expérience du doux et de l'amer, . . . ainsi l'esprit, après avoir acquis par l'expérience de l'un et de l'autre la connaissance du bien, devient plus scrupuleusement attentif à le conserver en obéissant à Dieu (*Haer* 4,39,1).

---

[27] Cf. n. 13.

[28] Cette différence entre la théologie d'Irénée et la tradition ultérieure est très bien vue par Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of saint Irenaeus, op. cit.*, p. 213s.

[29] Voir P. Evieux, "Théologie de l'accoutumance chez saint Irénée," *RSR* 55, 1967, pp. 24-26.

[30] Id., pp. 34-36.

L'être humain apprend à connaître par l'expérience des contraires. Il en est de même du mal et de la mort. Connaissant ces maux, l'être humain reçoit de Dieu un accomplissement bien plus grand que s'il n'en avait pas fait l'expérience. En fait, il ne peut y avoir accomplissement que par cette voie.

En résumé pour Irénée le salut est passage de la condition psychique du premier Adam à la condition spirituelle du dernier Adam. Le salut est en même temps passage de la mort à la vie, de l'ignorance à la connaissance, c'est-à-dire à la gnose, car le salut est connaissance (*Haer* 4,33,7-8). Cette dernière remarque montre qu'Adam ne pouvait pas rester dans l'ignorance du bien et du mal.

Cette connaissance permet à l'être humain de connaître en vérité sa situation par rapport à Dieu son Créateur et ainsi de se tourner vers lui pour recevoir son accomplissement. Dans cette perspective, si le salut est effectivement connaissance de Dieu par l'homme[31] (*Haer* 4,6,4; 4,20,6), il est également connaissance par l'être humain de sa propre condition psychique. C'est dans l'acceptation de cette condition que l'être humain peut être transformé pour accéder à la condition nouvelle, spirituelle, du Christ Jésus ressuscité, grâce au don de l'Esprit que le Christ procure.

Université de Metz

[31] Voir, par exemple, R. Tremblay, *La manifestation et la vision de Dieu selon S. Irénée de Lyon*, Münster, 1978; M.A. Donovan, "Alive to the Glory of God: a Key Insight in St. Irenaeus," *Theological Studies* 49, 1988, pp. 283-297.

THE DATE OF THE *PHYSIOLOGUS*

BY

ALAN SCOTT

Most scholars date the *Physiologus* toward the end of the second century,[1] sometimes quite confidently.[2] This is based on the following arguments: 1) that the manuscript tradition does not allow any date later than the second century; 2) the *Physiologus* was used by Clement of Alexandria; 3) the heterodox ("gnostic") nature of the text suggests an earlier rather than a later date. In fact many scholars have been so bold as to place it specifically in second century Alexandria.[3]

That the *Physiologus* was written in Egypt does appear certain,[4] but there is no compelling reason to insist on a connection with Alexandria. Furthermore, all arguments that place it in the second century can be shown to lack any real force. It is far more likely that the *Physiologus* dates from no earlier than the third century, and it probably was written after Origen, who died around 254.

---

[1] B.E. Perry "Physiologus," *PW* 20 (1941) 1103; Fritz Hommel, *Die aethiopische Übersetzung des Physiologus* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1877) xi; Francis J. Carmody, *Physiologus: The Very Ancient Book of Beasts, Plants and Stones* (San Francisco: The Book Club of California, 1953) 1; R. Riedinger "Der Physiologos und Klemens von Alexandreia," *ByZ* 66 (1973) 304; U. Treu, "Zur Datierung des Physiologus," *ZNW* 57 (1966) 104; Friedrich Pfister, "Von den Wundern des Morgenlandes," *DeutJahrbfVolksK* (1955) = *Kleine Schriften zum Alexanderroman*, BKlP 61 (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1976) 134.

[2] Klaus Alpers, "Untersuchungen zum griechischen Physiologus und den Kyraniden," *Vestigia Bibliae* 6 (1984) 14: "Als Entstehungszeit dürfte nunmehr mit Sicherheit das zweite Jahrhundert n. Chr. festgestellt sein."

[3] So Hommel xi-xii, Alpers "Untersuchungen" 14, Riedinger *ByZ* 70, 111-112, James Carlill, *The Epic of the Beast* (London: Routledge & Sons, 1924) 172; Guido Jüttner, "Heilmittel," *RAC* 14 (1987) 252.

Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza, *Il Fisiologo nella tradizione letteraria Germanica* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1992) suggests late second or early third century Alexandria, p. 13. Patricia Cox also regards it as obviously Alexandrian, "The Physiologus: A Poiesis of Nature," *Church History* 52 (1983) 436.

[4] Convincing arguments in Hommel, *Übersetzung* xv-xvi. See also E. Brunner-Traut, "Altägyptische Mythen in *Physiologus*," *Antaios* 10 (1968) 184-94.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998 *Vigiliae Christianae* 52, 430-441

Arguments based on the ms. tradition are complicated because of the state of the critical text. Sbordone's edition of the *Physiologus* was a watershed; his identification of three main redactions (primitive, Byzantine, and pseudo-Basil) has been generally accepted, though the dates of each recension remain uncertain.[5] He also succeeded in amassing a wealth of manuscript evidence and zoological parallels. His text, however, did not achieve the editorial ideal of ending all efforts at critical improvement.

Despite consideration of a fearful amount of evidence (the apparatus and notes dwarf the printed text), further manuscript evidence was brought to light by Ben Perry. Perry showed that one of the manuscripts Sbordone missed was the oldest Greek one (G),[6] which was equal in importance to the four main text types which Sbordone had identified as making up the oldest recensions (ΜΓ, Σαλς, WO[7] and ΑΕΠ). Furthermore, Sbordone has been taken to task by many scholars[8] for virtually ignoring the considerable body of evidence in ancient translation (chiefly Latin, Ethiopic and Syriac, though a host of others as well)[9]—no small matter when the oldest extant manuscripts of the *Physiologus* are in fact in Latin.[10]

Judging by the manuscript tradition, Sbordone thought that the text could not have been written later than the second century.[11] His argument

---

[5] Fr. Sbordone, *Physiologus* (Rome: Dante Albrighi, 1936) p. xii, puts the second or Byzantine recension in the 5th-6th century, while Perry puts it in the 11th; Sbordone puts the ps.-Basil version in the 10-11th century while Perry puts it in the 12th; Perry, review of Sbordone, *AJPh* 58 (1937) 494. Riedinger calls Sbordone's edition "an astonishing accomplishment", "Physiologus," p. 273.

[6] Morgan library cod. 397. See Perry's review of Offermanns in *Gn* 40 (1968) 416, and P. Maas's review in *ByZ* 37 (1937) 379. Perry says that G "disappeared from the monastery at Gottaferrata in the time of the Napoleonic wars, remained unknown throughout the 19th century, and was purchased from a book seller in Paris in 1908 for the Pierpont Morgan Library . . . [It was] written in the late tenth century by an ignorant scribe in southern Italy." "Fable," *Studium Generale* 12 (1959) 36.

[7] Lauchert's edn. (which is still quoted in some of the most recent literature) rests largely on W (= Vind. theol. gr. 128).

[8] Especially by Francis J. Carmody, *Physiologus* p. iv. Carmody's translation is based largely on the Latin and Oriental evidence.

[9] The younger Latin and Syriac versions, the Armenian, and also the Georgian are derived from the Byzantine recension, Perry *AJPh* 58 (1937) 489.

[10] "Two at Berne are seemingly of the eighth and the ninth centuries respectively, and one at Brussels of the tenth century", Halldór Hermannsson, *The Icelandic Physiologus*, Iclandica 27 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1938) 5. There is a facsimile edn. of the older Berne mss.: Christoph von Steiger, Otto Homburger (ed.), *Physiologus Bernensis* (Basel: Alkuin, 1964).

[11] P. xii.

goes like this. Ms. Π[12] in type AEΠ had already been used by pseudo-Eustathius, whom Sbordone referred to as simply as Eustathius and dated to the fourth century. On text critical grounds he judged the order and chapter numbering of manuscripts AE earlier than Π, therefore to the end of the third century. Sbordone thought class MΓ and Σαλς of the first redaction were in turn earlier than AE, and so must have been done by about 200.[13] Sbordone (basically followed by Perry) thinks that we must posit this early date in order to leave enough time for Π to have been used by pseudo-Eustathius.

There are a number of things wrong with this argument (P. Maas dismissed it simply as "phantastisch").[14] First, Carmody pronounces Sbordone's critical method unsound. Though unfortunately not going into details, Carmody regards Σ and W to belong to one primitive group and Π to belong to another (Perry had not yet discovered G), and in his view "between the prototype of the groups represented by W and Π no chronology can be determined."[15] He claimed support for this in his evaluation of the ancient translations: he reports that the Armenian and the Latin y [a][16] establish the authenticity of much in ms. Π, which Lauchert, Sbordone, and Perry all regarded as relatively late.[17]

Second, it has subsequently turned out that Sbordone (following Lauchert and others) assumed a date for the Ethiopic translation which in fact was too early:[18] one of the reasons for regarding ms. Π as later was its disagree-

---

[12] Codex Mosquensis, Synod. bibl. 432, 11th century. Edited by A. Karnejev in *ByZ* 3 (1894) 32-63.

[13] *Richerche sulle Fonti e sulla Composizione del Physiologus greco* (Naples: G. Torella, 1936) 158; *Physiologus* p. lxxviii.

[14] Review of Sbordone, *ByZ* 37 (1937) 379.

[15] "Physiologus Latinus Versio Y," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 12.7 (1941) 96-7.

[16] The two crucial Latin mss. are a and b. They have a common source in y, which no longer survives. The longer text is a, and b is the source of all the later Latin versions. "Carmody complicates matters needlessly by referring to versio a, the longer text, as y," Hanneke Wirtjes, *The Middle English Physiologus* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991) lxxiii n. 1. Giovanni Orlandi (who also refers to the ms. labeled "a" by Wirtjes as "y") says that y is earlier than b, "La Tradizione del 'Physiologus,'" *Settimane di Studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 31.2 (1985) 1079.

[17] Fr. Lauchert, review of Zoepfl, *Theol. Revue* 1929, 161; B.E. Perry *AJPh* 58 (1937) 491.

[18] Hommel, *Übersetzung* xviii, puts it in the fifth century, but Carlo Conti Rossini, "Il *Fisiologo* etiopico," *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici* 10 (1951) 14, puts it in the sixth or seventh century; Alpers, "Untersuchungen," 57 n. 8 cites Enno Littmann, "Die äthiopische Literatur", *HdO* 3.2-3 (1954) 377, who dates it to the seventh century.

ment with the Ethiopic. Third, Sbordone's argument also depends on a date for pseudo-Eustathius that is very possibly too early. In his monograph on pseudo-Eustathius, Zoepfl calculates that he wrote some time between the last quarter of the fourth and the end of the fifth century A.D.[19] If his work came from the latter part of that spectrum, all of Sbordone's dates get pushed forward nearly a century. In other words, even if we accept Sbordone's basic proposal—and this at best is controversial—the date of the oldest recension could end up somewhere near 300 if pseudo-Eustathius worked nearer the end of the fifth century.

Another way to try to date the text of course would be to see where it has been first cited, but unfortunately this also proves to be difficult terrain. Lauchert and Emil Peters put the work before 140,[20] due largely to the claim that the text had been used in Barnabas and in Justin Martyr. A host of other early Christian writers have also been credited with using the text. This has led to an error which is exemplified by Carmody, who writes that "In both versions"—i.e. W and Π, which he regarded as the best Greek manuscripts available—"one might get the impression that the language is of the fourth or fifth century, but their use by Justinus Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria proves greater age."[21]

All recent discussions agree that Lauchert's date to the early second century is too early. The parallels in Justin[22] are very faint, and the *Physiologus* has probably used Barnabas rather than the reverse (see below). In fact, most of the alleged parallels between the *Physiologus* and early Christian literature are very general in character.

The first hard evidence of the *Physiologus*' use is in the second half of the fourth century, and here there is a solid phalanx of witnesses. It is apparent, as van den Broek notes, that Epiphanius has used the *Physiologus* in his *Panarion* (written by 377), because in Epiphanius's version of the phoenix story, the worm reborn in the ashes becomes a mature bird *on the third day*, a detail otherwise only known in the *Physiologus*; the same may again be true in the detail that the phoenix shows itself to the priests who had served it.[23]

---

[19] Friedrich Zoepfl, *Der Kommentar des Pseudo-Eustathios zum Hexaëmeron* (Münster i. W.: Aschendorf, 1927) 55. Corazza *Fisiologo* p. 20 n. 44 puts ps.-Eustathius in the third century, but even the genuine Eustathius lived in the early fourth.

[20] Fr. Lauchert *Geschichte des Physiologus* (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1889) 64-5; Peters *Der griechische Physiologus und seine orientalischen Übersetzungen* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1898) 1.

[21] "Physiologus Latinus Versio Y" 96-7.

[22] 1 *Apol.* 55; *Dial.* 90.

[23] R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix* (Leiden: Brill, 1972) 214-5 and 223-4. The latter has good witnesses but is not universally attested (see p. 223 n. 5).

In Epiphanius' *De Gemmis*, an exposition of the 12 stones on the breastplate of the high priest in Exodus 28:17-20 (written some time before 394) we are told "when the lioness bears a cub, it lies three days dead and on the third rises," which probably is based on *Physiologus* chapter 1.[24] A Coptic fragment of the *De Gemmis* explicitly cites the *Physiologus* in his section on De Amethysto, though it is very uncertain if that reading was in the original Greek.[25] Epiphanius' idea that the hyacinth ("carbunculus") gleams at night is reminiscent of the *Physiologus*' report that adamantine is only found at night.[26]

Even more than these parallels, however, the *De Gemmis* is important for our purposes because here we have a text similar in character to the *Physiologus*. Robert P. Blake writes,

> We meet with the same type of bold comparisons, the same fantastic stories, the same recognition of the works of God made manifest in the doings or actions of his inferior creatures. It is not the direct borrowing that is striking—it is the general character and method of the discussion.[27]

In both works there is also a clear separation of a physical/descriptive section from a moral/allegorical interpretation. Clearly the *De Gemmis* has been influenced by the *Physiologus*.

The case of Ambrose in the *Hexaemeron* (written some time between 386-390) gets us on even firmer ground since his description of the partridge shares some 90 words with the Latin translation (versio b) of the description of the partridge in the *Physiologus*.[28] This is particularly impor-

---

[24] Trans. Blake (from the Georgian version). The Georgian is a translation twice, in fact probably thrice, removed from the original (i.e. Greek to Syriac to Armenian to Georgian).

[25] The Coptic, edited by de Vis, is in Blake's edn. p. 291. The Latin version refers instead to "hi, qui fabulis credunt" (p. 192, 10-12 Dindorf). The passage is omitted in the Georgian. There is no clear formula for knowing which version to prefer, see Blake lxxxix.

[26] *De Gemmis* 20 (*Opera* ed. Dindorf, vol. 4 part 1 p. 183, 3-10).

[27] Robert P. Blake, *Epiphanius De Gemmis*, Studies and Documents 2 (London: Christopers, 1934) cxv. Christel Meier generally agrees, but with qualifications and caution: *Gemma Spiritalis*, Münstersche Mittelalter-schriften 34.1 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1977) 132-3.

[28] So Francis J. Carmody *Physiologus Latinus: Éditions préliminaires versio b* (Paris: E. Droz 1939) 45-6. Cf. *Physiologus* ch. 18 Sbordone.

Nikolaus Henkel notes that this is not quite an airtight argument, since a popular work like the *Hexaemeron* might well have influenced the Latin translation of the *Physiologus*, *Studien zum Physiologus im Mittelalter*, Hermae 38 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1976) 83. Contamination of the *Physiologus* by another early Father is evident in the Syriac version edited by Land, see Beryl Rowland "The Relationship of St. Basil's Hexaemeron to the Physiologus," *Cahiers d'études médiévales* 2-3 (1984) 493.

tant for the question of the treatise's date as versio b would appear to be more recent than the other Latin translation, y [a].[29] In other words, we need to allow time for the *Physiologus* to be translated into Latin, and then for another Latin translation to be made, which in turn was used by Ambrose. Other parallels in Ambrose also might be uncertainly traced to the *Physiologus*.[30]

Henry Chadwick argues that Priscillian of Avila probably is opposing views put forth in the *Physiologus*.[31] Priscillian attacked those who interpreted the appearance of "griffins, eagles, asses, elephants, and serpents as symbols of divine worship ('religio') when a correct exegesis must understand them as demonic forces."[32] Priscillian was active in the second half of the fourth century.

The *Physiologus* is also explicitly quoted by Rufinus in the year 407-8, and all sides agree that this reflects direct use of the *Physiologus*.[33] Finally, as previously noted, the *Physiologus* is frequently used by pseudo-Eustathius, who wrote some time between the last quarter of the fourth and the end of the fifth century A.D.[34]

Because of these citations it is clear that the *Physiologus* cannot have been written after the late fourth century. Its use in a secondary Latin version by Ambrose, and the breadth of its use in 4th and 5th century scholarship suggests it either must have circulated significantly earlier or it must have been instantly very popular and much copied. How much earlier could it have been written?

Critical to Treu and Alpers' arguments for a second century date is the alleged use of the *Physiologus* by Clement of Alexandria. On closer investigation this proves to be a slender reed. Both scholars accept Rudolf Riedinger's assertion that the *Physiologus* has influenced a lost work of

---

[29] See above n. 16.

[30] *De Tobia* 12.41 with *Physiologus* 12; *In Ps. 118* 20.2 (PL 15,1560d-61a) with *Physiologus* 11. Ambrose, *Expositio in Psalmum 118* 19.13 (PL 15,1549 bc), sometimes cited as a parallel, refers to the marvelous properties of the turtledove, phoenix, and eagle, three animals treated in the *Physiologus*, but closer examination shows that his description of the eagle is the same as that in Aelian 2.26 and quite different from the *Physiologus*.

[31] *Priscillian of Avila*, Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 93.

[32] *Id.* 91.

[33] "Nam Physiologus de catulo leonis haec scribit, quod cum natus fuerit, tribus diebus ac tribus noctibus dormiat. . . ." Rufinus *De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum* 1.6 SC 140, 46; the date is from Simonetti, *ibid.*, p. 25. In the older literature this is cited as [Origen] *In Gen.* Hom. 17 (PG 12,257bc).

[34] Zoepfl, *Kommentar* 55.

Clement of Alexandria, the *Hypotyposen*.[35] This in turn depends on his prior argument that pseudo-Caesarius' *Erotapokriseis* is in part a paraphrase of the *Hypotyposen*, a theory based on parallels between pseudo-Caesarius and later authors, especially Isidore of Pelusium.[36]

Riedinger's theory is too complicated to be assessed here in detail; it is enough for the present to observe that this has not been accepted by scholars of Clement of Alexandria. The reconstruction of lost works is a tricky matter even when there are explicit quotations of it. Riedinger, having none in the authors on whom he focuses, relies on a web of parallels. He deserves credit for digging up the similarities that he has, but none are particularly close, and there are other possible explanations of how they occurred.

For Riedinger's theory to be accepted, there would need to be convincing parallels between the existing Clementine corpus and the *Physiologus*, and there are none. Every parallel in the undisputed corpus of Clement on which Riedinger and the older scholarship (such as Lauchert) relies are commonplaces with ample examples in other ancient texts.[37] There is in short no reason to think Clement of Alexandria has used the *Physiologus* as a source.

The last argument Treu and others raise to give the *Physiologus* an earlier date is its alleged "gnosticism."[38] Even if this premise could be accepted, this would not necessarily imply an early date. The Greek originals of various Coptic gnostic codices discovered in this century (e.g. the *Testimony of Truth*) were written as late as the third century. Much more was theologically possible in the Christian church before the death of Epiphanius and

---

[35] See especially "Der Physiologos und Klemens von Alexandreia," *ByZ* 66 (1973) 273-307.

[36] See Utto Riedinger [Utto Riedinger and Rudolf Riedinger are the same person], "Neue Hypotyposen-Fragmente bei Pseudo-Caesarius und Isidore von Pelusium," *ZNW* 51 (1960) 154-96, and "Die Paraphrase des Hypotyposenabschnittes zu Prov. 30,18-20 (24,53-55) von Klemens von Alexandreia bei Isidoros von Pelusion und Pseudo-Kaisarios," *ByZ* 57 (1964) 15-25. This bold thesis unfortunately is not commented on by Pierre Évieux in his recent *Isidore de Péluse* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1995).

[37] 1) *Strom.* 4.16.100,3 with *Physiologus* 10. See e.g. Herodotus 3.109. 2) *Exhort.* 10.105,4-106.2 with *Phys.* 21, but here there is simple dependence on Psalm 57:5 (58:4). 3) *Strom.* 7.9, and *Strom.* 2 (2,126,26), with *Physiologus* 38, but see e.g. Apollonius *Hist. Mir.* 23; 4) *Strom.* 2.139.4 with *Physiologus* 28, but see e.g. Pliny 10.104. 5) *Paed.* 2.118.5 with Physiologus 44, but see e.g. Aelian *H.N.* 10.13; 15.8.

[38] So recently R. Riedinger, *ByZ* 70 (1977) 111-12; and U. Treu, "The Physiologus and the Early Fathers," *StudPatr* 24 (1993) 200.

the great Origenist controversy of the last decade of the fourth century than after.

And this premise is weak. There is little connection between the *Physiologus* and the world of gnosticism.[39] Its asceticism simply reflects the spirit of the age and does not connect it with any particular Christian sect. Treu lays great stress on the theme of how, when Christ descended through the heavens, he took the form of various powers.[40] The idea is found in some gnostic texts, but was also more widely disseminated by Origen. It is thus cribbed *inter alia* by Jerome,[41] who of course is neither early nor gnostic. With its constant citations of scripture, the *Physiologus* more closely resembles Egyptian monastic texts than e.g. the extensive collection of gnostic texts discovered near Nag Hammadi. The claims that the *Physiologus* must have been written at an early date are very fragile.

In fact, the evidence suggests strongly that it is not a work of primitive Christianity. The *Physiologus* cites the Gospel of John as scripture, and John is not treated as scripture until Tatian and Heracleon in the 150's and 60's.[42] Riedinger is probably correct in regarding *Physiologus* chapter 34 as having used the *Protevangelium of James* as a source,[43] and the *Protevangelium* "cannot have been written before 150."[44] Alpers argues, again probably rightly, that the *Physiologus* uses Barnabas's (written ca. 140) versions of Leviticus 10:1,4; 11:12-19, and of Deuteronomy 14:10-18. In chapter 24 the *Physiologus* also probably cites Barnabas 10.7 (on the hyena),[45] and the interpretation of Moses stretching out his hands as a typological reference to the crucifixion probably follows Barnabas 12.2.[46]

It is not surprising that the *Physiologus* refers to Thecla, not only because she was a popular figure but because the author of the *Physiologus* surely must have been interested in the fantastic stories about animals in these

---

[39] See already Lauchert *Geschichte* 49; Perry "Physiologus" 1100.

[40] *ZNW* 57,104, followed by Corazza, *Fisiologo* 13-14 n. 26.

[41] PL 26,493.

[42] Arguments have been made for citations of the Gospel of John in Ignatius, but this is uncertain.

[43] Review of Kaimakis, *ByZ* 70 (1977) 111.

[44] So O. Cullmann, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Edgar Hennecke, Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) 1:372; it "originated in the second half of the second century," H.R. Smid, *Protevangelium Jacobi*, trans. Mrs. G.E. van Baaren-Pape (Assen: van Gorcum, 1965) 24.

[45] Alpers 29f.

[46] U. Treu, *Physiologus* (Hanua: Werner Dausieu, 1981) 141.

legends. And the references to Thecla in the *Physiologus*, though conceivably based on some oral tradition (so Lauchert, Perry),[47] are more likely derived from the *Acts of Paul* (written perhaps 185-195).[48] Many manuscripts of the *Physiologus* even refer (ch. 40) to the seals which threatened Thecla in the *Acts of Paul*, a text which has long puzzled scholars, and which surely would have been transformed into something else if the text had been loose in an oral tradition for any length of time.

Two of the existing arguments for a still later date remain valid. Erik Peterson points out that the *Physiologus* uses πολιτευτής to mean "ascetic", which is not an early usage, but later becomes common in Coptic (i.e. Egyptian monastic) literature.[49] The *Physiologus*' consistent hostility toward concupiscence, though clearly possible in the second century, fits in well with the world of developing monasticism, as he rightly notes. E. Brunner-Traut notes that *Physiologus* chap. 45 is based on the premise that the numbers of pagans and Christians are about equal, which certainly would not have been the case in the second century,[50] and would only be true in certain regions and not in the empire as a whole even in the time of Constantine.

Not enough attention has been paid to the very late way the *Physiologus* uses the Christian canon. First, it apparently knows the distinction between Old Testament and New Testament. The argument[51] that ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη in chapters 36 and 44 can mean something besides "New Testament" is weak. It can indeed mean "new dispensation" instead of a collection of canonical books, which is the way it is used in the earliest church. But the use in the *Physiologus* does indeed appear to be a reference to the existence of a body of scripture, the interpretation of which can help the individual. In the older meaning, the old dispensation is always contrasted with the new, but in the *Physiologus* the two are part of a common heritage, as we would expect if it were simply a reference to a canon. In 36, the two horns on the hydra are said to be the old and new διαθήκη, using which one can master the passions. In 44 (pp. 134-5), the conch makes pearls

---

[47] "Physiologus" 1102.

[48] For the date see W. Schneemelcher in Hennecke/Schneemelcher 2:351.

[49] "Die Spiritualität des griechischen Physiologos", *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome: Herder, 1959) 241.

[50] "Der ägyptische Ursprung des 45. Kapitels des Physiologus und seine Datierung," *Studien zur altagytischen Kultur*, FS Wolfgang Helck, ed. Hartwig Altenmüller, Dietrich Wildung (Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 1984) 565. Even in Origen's day the total Christian population is said to be small, *CCel* 8.69.

[51] In Perry "Physiologus" 1102; F. Drexl's review of Wellmann, *ByZ* 33 (1933) 367.

by surfacing in the early morning hours and taking in light from its two flaps. It is located by the Agate, which attaches itself to pearls and then is retrieved by divers. "The sea then is the world; the divers are the chorus of prophets; the two flaps of the conch are the old and new διαθήκη." It would appear that διαθήκη is being used in its later sense, "Testament."

At every point the *Physiologus* differs precisely from second century writings by presupposing a canon approximately equivalent to the one accepted in the third century and after. It is important to observe that no non-canonical text is cited as scripture; here it differs from a second century writer such as Clement, and even from many third century writers.[52]

Finally, the *Physiologus's* citation of the Epistle to James as scripture is critical to questions of its date. James is never quoted by second century writers—not even by Irenaeus and Tertullian, who quote almost every other New Testament book. James's status as scripture was still controversial in Origen's day (he is the first author who mentions this letter); it was even being rejected as late as Theodore of Mopsuestia.[53] On the other hand, James is accepted as scripture in a matter-of-fact way by the *Physiologus* chapters 13 and 20.

The question of the *Physiologus'* literary genre is also significant. As many scholars have noted, the *Physiologus* has extensive parallels with pagan paradoxography, which dates back to Callimachus (third century B.C.). Occasional paradoxographical references are part of the literary discourse of the age, so that e.g. an offhand reference to the phoenix can be made as early as Clement of Rome.[54] There are numerous references in Philo, who devotes a treatise to beasts.[55] But extensive treatment of paradoxographical material in the formative years of Christian theology is unknown.

Early Christian theology does not show much literary variation: epistolary parenesis, sermon, Gospel, myth (in Christian gnosticism), church orders, and apocalypses. Apology only becomes established in the middle

---

[52] A further minor argument for a later date is the serious interest taken in the Old Testament by the *Physiologus*. Before Origen, patristic use of the Old Testament to a surprising degree centers on Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms, and Isaiah. The ease with which the *Physiologus* refers to books like the Song of Solomon, Job, Zechariah, or Malachi, though not without precedent in the second century, would be unusual.

[53] Feine-Behm-Kümmel *Introduction to the New Testament*, 14th edn., trans. A.J. Mattill, Jr. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966) 285.

[54] 1 Clement 25.

[55] *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus*, Abraham Terian, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism 1 (Chico, California: Scholars, 1981).

part of the second century when it is championed by Justin, who was of such stature that even Celsus apparently read him.[56] Heresiology only becomes established when it similarly was launched by Justin (again) and later by Irenaeus. Even so conventional a literary type as allegory (which obviously constitutes the heart of the *Physiologus*) only becomes a central literary technique somewhat later by Clement of Alexandria, who was again a figure of considerable stature. His trailblazing work was of course enormously aided by the similar labors of Philo Judaeus. Furthermore, though there are the beginnings of such an enterprise as early as Valentinus[57] and Clement,[58] the first full length non-scriptural Christian allegory besides the *Physiologus* is Epiphanius's *De Gemmis*, which is perhaps why Epiphanius is among the attributed authors of the *Physiologus* in the Middle Ages.

The *Physiologus* is of course anonymous, and may be the product of a number of authors. Would a work of nascent Christianity, of presumably humble origin, be so innovative? Its allegorical treatment of largely pagan (pseudo-)scientific material simply does not fit the framework of second century Christian literature.

That there is a literary relationship between the *Physiologus* and Origen is more assured. Not only are there stronger and more convincing zoological parallels, there is also an unmistakable allegorical parallel.[59] The question is, who has influenced whom, and it is more likely that it is Origen who has influenced the *Physiologus*. Origen frequently refers to pagan zoological/paradoxographical material, and in doing so he normally relies on pagan sources, not on Christian sources, and certainly not on a primitive work like the *Physiologus*.[60] That a Christian in Egypt might use Origen is easy to believe; that Origen might use a book like the *Physiologus* is doubtful.

This is particularly true of the allegorical parallels between the two. Origen's chief fame in his own day was not his speculative theology (which has been more controversial to enemies and interesting to scholars), but

---

[56] Carl Andresen, *Logos und Nomos* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1955).

[57] See David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California, 1992) 4.

[58] See *Paed.* 2.119, cited by Robert Halleux, Jacques Schamp, *Les Lapidaires grecs* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985) xxxiii.

[59] Zoological: See Lauchert, *Geschichte* 70-2. Allegorical: see by the present author, "Zoological Marvel and Exegetical Method," Festschrift *Rowan Greer*, ed. David Brakke and Charles A. Bobertz (Fortress Press, forthcoming).

[60] See Bernhard Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, SBA 18.1-2 (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1987) 195-8.

his exegesis; the idea of him using the *Physiologus* for exegetical guidance is far-fetched.[61] His commentary on the Song of Solomon was enormously influential,[62] and the four references to the Song of Solomon in the *Physiologus* are probably further testimony to his impact on his contemporaries and on the next generation of theologians. Certainty is not possible at this point, but it looks as if the *Physiologus* was written in the wake of Origen's theology.[63] This would also be consistent with the concept of the canon presupposed by this work, and with the large size of the Christian church presupposed by chapter 45. For these reasons the *Physiologus* was not written earlier than the third century, and probably not earlier than the mid-third century.

Dating the *Physiologus* to the second century should be regarded as very unlikely. It was probably written after Origen and indebted to his theological imagination. It may have been written in Alexandria, but it may also have been written outside, e.g. in monastic circles. The fact that the *Physiologus* is cited in a secondary Latin version already by the time of Ambrose suggests it cannot have been written much later than the mid-third century, and that it must have been widely copied very quickly.

138 Boston Post Rd., *East Lyme*, Ct. 06333 USA

[61] One further minor argument against an early date to the text is as follows. The emphatic declaration that Jesus was crucified only once (*Physiologus* 33 bis) looks like a reaction to one of the charges frequently made against Origen, that he thought Christ's act of redemption would extend throughout eternity to take in those not saved by repentance in this life.

[62] See Henri Crouzel's remarks in his preface to *Origène: Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, SC 375 (Paris: du Cerf, 1991) 55-68.

[63] This was the opinion of Max Wellmann, *Der Physiologus*, Philol. Suppl. 22 (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1931) 3-4, though his reasons are not strong.

REVIEWS

Halvor Moxnes, ed., *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor.* London: Routledge, 1997.

This multi-authored collection arose out of a 1995 Oslo conference on "Family as a Social Reality and Metaphor in Early Christianity." As the title suggests, it focuses on two issues: family as a social structure within the early Christian movement, and the use of family metaphors in early Christian self-definition.

The first section, "The social context of early Christian families," is comprised of essays on Roman Galilee and, more generally, the religious, social and political contexts of Christian, Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions. The essays in the second section, "Family as Metaphor," examine the use of family-related metaphors in the rhetoric and symbol structure of early Christianity. The third section, "Family, Sexuality and Asceticism in Early Christianity," focuses on the rhetoric of asceticism and the interplay between rhetoric and reality in the Pauline letters, the Gospel of Thomas, and Gnostic religion.

A major strength of the collection is its detailed consideration of the metaphorical and rhetorical use of family language, and its self-conscious, and indeed, cautious approach to the intersection between literary metaphor and social reality. For example, Karol Ova Sandnes' essay, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspectives on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother- or Sisterhood and a Family" considers the structural relationship between two sets of metaphors used to describe early Christian community, namely, hierarchical household metaphors and egalitarian "brother/sisterhood" language. He concludes that the New Testament writings leave us with an ambiguous picture of a community in which egalitarian structures are emerging within patriarchal household structures (162).

A second strength is the consideration of early Christian family and metaphorical language in larger Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts. Reider Aasgaard's article, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul: Its Role and Character," compares the use of "brotherhood" language in these two writers. Their striking similarities suggest that Paul may have drawn some of his

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

notions of, and language for, Christian community from the broader intellectual climate of the Greco-Roman world (180). John M. G. Barclay examines "The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity." He argues that, in contrast to Judaism, early Christianity was ambivalent with respect to family life and "varied in its capacity to embed its religious convictions within the domestic spheres" (67). Eva Marie Lassen's article, "The Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor" concludes that some, though not all, of the family metaphors used in Christian communities would have shocked Romans, who conceived of family in strongly hierarchical terms. The comparative approach taken by these studies recognizes that Christianity, its metaphors and social structures, did not exist in a vacuum but interacted with the varied cultural contexts within which it developed and from which its converts were drawn. For the most part, the comparisons avoid stereotypes and negative judgments of either Judaism or Greco-Roman culture.

In light of the volume's emphasis on metaphorical language and its relationship to social realities, the relative absence of gender or feminist analysis is striking. Although Halvor Moxnes stresses the importance of gender perspectives in his introductory essay, "What is Family?", only one article carries out a gender analysis. In "Brotherhood in Christ: A Gender Hermeneutical Reading of 1 Thessalonians," Lone Fatum concludes that while women were among Paul's converts in Thessalonica, the patriarchal logic of Pauline argument effectively excludes them from Christian brotherhood as described by Paul. In Paul's dichotomous thought structures, the definition of women *qua* women excludes them from eschatological definition as Christians (194). Fatum's article is refreshing in its detailed analysis of Pauline hermeneutic, but it is marred by a monolithic and negative view of "traditional Jewish interpretation" which moulded Paul's exhortation to "former pagans to demonstrate their new Christian identity in accordance with Mosaic rules of purity and superior exclusiveness" (190-91).

A second difficulty with the volume lies with the honour-shame paradigm that underlies a number of the articles. According to this paradigm, there is a fixed amount of "honour" in a given culture. Males strive to gain or hold on to honour, and to avoid "shame," which is frequently related to the virginity and sexual fidelity of daughters and wives (Moxnes, 20). In "What is Family?", Moxnes argues that the disputes in the Gospels between Jesus and his opponents must be read in light of this honour culture (28). Philip F. Esler's article on "Family Imagery and Christian Identity in Gal 5:13 to 6:10" argues that Paul describes Christian community as a family

in which individuals do not seek their own honour but sees other members as brothers (122). In "The Family in First-Century Galilee," Santiago Guijarro argues that the family was the depository of "honour" and position as well as the transmitter of economic resources (62).

The honour-shame paradigm is based on anthropological studies of contemporary Mediterranean culture from which analogies are drawn to the early Jewish, Christian and Greco-Roman societies which inhabited the Mediterranean area. The work of Bruce Malina, who is cited frequently in the volume, has been particularly influential in applying this approach to the study of early Christianity. The paradigm, and its widespread application, however, have come under scrutiny in recent anthropological work. Recent studies acknowledge the variety of contemporary Mediterranean cultures and argue that region, class, economics, and other factors lead to considerable differences among the various groups in the Mediterranean area. If so, how do we apply insights about the workings of a particular Mediterranean culture in our own time to our analyses of the varied Mediterranean cultures of two millennia ago?

Furthermore, the differences among contemporary Mediterranean groups affect the presence or absence of the honour-shame paradigm and the ways in which it functions in a given society. David Kertzer comments that the pervasive use of the honour-shame paradigm in the field of anthropology has led to the neglect of more important elements of Mediterranean culture. Whereas this paradigm was once the "bread and butter" of Mediterranean anthropology, "we are now ready for a richer diet" (Review of David D. Gilmore, ed. *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, in *American Anthropologist* 89/4 (1987) 991).

Despite these problems, the collection is a fascinating and important addition to the growing literature on the family in early Christianity, Judaism, and Greco-Roman society. Most interesting is the attention given to the distinction between metaphor and reality and the cautious and insightful attempts to move from one to the other. What emerges is the centrality of family as social unit and as metaphor in early Christian texts and in the self-understanding of the societies which created these texts.

Department of Religious Studies ADELE REINHARTZ
McMaster University,
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4K1

1. Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, *Origeniana et Rufiniana* (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 29). Freiburg, Herder, 1994. 254 S.
2. Hermann Josef Frede und Herbert Stanjek, *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum.* I. In Epistolam ad Romanos (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 31). Freiburg, Herder, 1996. 346 S.; II. In Epistolas ad Corinthios usque ad Hebraeos (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 32). Freiburg, Herder, 1997. 516 S.
3. Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes.* Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins Buch 4-6. Zum Druck vorbereitet und gesetzt von H.J. Frede und H. Stanjek (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 33). Freiburg, Herder, 1997. 283 S.
4. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 12 (Pars II) Esaias, edidit Roger Gryson (fasc. 8: Is. 54,17-58,7; fasc. 9: Is. 58,8-61,10; fasc. 10: Is. 61,10-65,23; fasc. 11: Is. 65,23-fin. Conclusion: Histoire du texte, Compléments, Tables). Freiburg, Herder, 1996-1997, S. 1361-1708.
5. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 21 Epistula ad Romanos, herausgegeben von Hugo S. Eymann (Lief. 1, Einleitung). Freiburg, Herder, 1996, S. 1-80.

1. Caroline P. Hammond Bammel—1995 verstorben—hatte selbst noch den ersten Band ihrer gesammelten Aufsätze herausgegeben (*Tradition and Exegesis in Early Christian Writers*). Postum sind jetzt auch 9 Abhandlungen (erschienen zwischen 1973 und 1993), meist textkritischen und paläographischen Fragen gewidmet, in der Reihe *Vetus Latina* gesammelt worden. Origenes, und namentlich dessen Übersetzer Rufin von Aquilea, stehen im Zentrum des wissenschaftlichen Interesses der Verfasserin. Ein Artikel über eine Origenescatena zeigt uns, wie feinsinnig sie Texte zu analysieren weiss und wie sie mit einer einfachen Änderung der Interpunktion einem bisher unverständlichen Text seinen Sinn wiederzugeben vermag. Beachtenswert ist auch ihr Versuch, mittels einer alternativen Suggestion, die übliche Datierung von Rufins Abreise aus Aquilea nach Süditalien anzuzweifeln. Sie weist nach, dass die Datierung 407 nicht auf Tatsachen beruht und behandelt ausführlich die allerdings spärlichen Daten aus den letzten zehn Jahren von Rufins Leben.

2. Schon früher hatte Frede sich mit dem Collectaneum in Apostolum des Sedulius befasst. Er hatte bereits 1961 einen Teil dieses Kommentars, den Text des Collectaneum zum Epheserbrief und den bis dahin noch unveröffentlichten Prolog, in einer kritischen Edition herausgegeben. Die Ausgabe des ganzen Collectaneums hat jedoch 35 Jahre auf sich warten lassen.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

Die bisherigen Editionen, wovon jene in der *Patrologia Latina* von Migne die Reihe schliesst, gehen alle auf die *editio princeps* des Johannes Sichardus zurück, die nur auf einer jetzt verschollenen Handschrift aus Fulda beruht.

In der Einleitung der neuen Edition werden die 6 jetzt bekannten Handschriften des Collectaneums beschrieben. Davon ist vor allem R (Zürich, aus der Abtei Rheinau), die gegen 900, kaum ein Jahrhundert nach der Verfassung von Sedulius' Schrift, geschrieben wurde, wichtig. Nur in dieser und in einer Fuldaer Handschrift aus dem 12. Jahrhundert findet sich der Prolog. Bemerkenswert ist, dass sich in diesem Prolog bereits die auf Aristoteles zurückgehenden *circumstantiae* finden (bekannt aus dem mittelalterlichen Hexameter: *Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando*). Das Kommentarwerk des Sedulius zu den Paulinen steht uns jetzt in einer musterhaften Ausgabe in zwei Bänden zur Verfügung.

3. Die letzte Arbeit von Caroline P. Hammond Bammel ist postum erschienen: der zweite Teil des Römerbriefkommentars des Origenes in der Übersetzung Rufins. Die Arbeit am Römerbrieftext des Rufin hat sie ihr ganzes Leben hindurch begleitet. Am Anfang stand ihre Dissertation über die handschriftliche Überlieferung, die unter der Betreuung von Henry Chadwick zustande kam. Eine weitere Vorarbeit erschien 1985 in der Reihe *Vetus Latina* (Band 10: *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung*). Sind die Bücher 1-3 des Kommentars 1990 erschienen (*Vetus Latina* 16), jetzt liegen auch die Bücher 4-6 vor, wobei für die Fertigstellung des 6. Buchs die Autorin von verschiedenen Seiten unterstützt wurde. Aufgrund der hinterlassenen Notizen der Handschriftenkollationen kann innerhalb kurzer Zeit auch der restliche Teil des Kommentars (die Bücher 7-10) vorgelegt werden. Die sorgfältige Edition muss als eine grossartige Leistung gewürdigt werden.

4. Mit den neuen Lieferungen des Buches Isaias (Pars II, Lief. 8-11) sind im ganzen seit 1987 insgesamt 21 Lieferungen erschienen (fast zwei pro Jahr). Mit der Abschliessung von Pars II steht uns jetzt der vollständige Isaiastext zur Verfügung. Die letzte Lieferung enthält Nachträge, Ergänzungen zur Textgeschichte und Indizes. Ausserdem ist hier zu bemerken, dass die kritische Edition des Isaias-Kommentars des Hieronymus in der Reihe *Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* (Gryson-Deproost-Somers), die aus der Arbeit an dem Isaias-Text hervorgegangen ist, schon bis zur Hälfte der vorgesehenen 4 Bände fortgeschritten ist.

5. Nachdem die Edition des Hebräerbriefes (H.J. Frede) 1991 abgeschlossen war, begann U. Fröhlich 1995 mit der Herausgabe des ersten Korintherbriefes. Ein Jahr später hat H. Eymann mit der Edition des Römerbriefes ange-

fangen. Fredes Arbeiten hatten schon gezeigt, dass die Überlieferungsgeschichte des lateinischen Paulustextes für alle Briefe im wesentlichen gleich verlaufen ist. Etliche vom Editor vorgenommene Stichproben haben das für den Römerbrief bestätigt. In der ersten Lieferung wird zunächst ein Überblick über die handschriftliche Überlieferung gegeben (der Römerbrief steht in der westlichen Tradition an der Spitze des ganzen Corpus Paulinum).

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

A. Rodrigues Pereira, Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-600 C.E). Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems, = Studia Semitica Neerlandica 34, Assen 1997.

Aramaic poetry, especially as it developed in the so-called Middle and Late Period (from 200 B.C.E. to ca. 700 C.E.) constitutes a complex phenomenon. It encompasses several dialects, such as Galilean Aramaic, Babylonian Aramaic, Syriac, Samaritan Aramaic, *Mandaic*, and its history spans seven to eight centuries. Moreover, the texts that have been written in all these dialects are linked to different religious communities: Jewish, Christian, Samaritan and *Mandaean*.

In order to attain more insight into the variety of literary traditions and their background, R. has selected and compared 28 examples of Middle and Late Aramaic poetry, deriving from different religious and cultural spheres: a fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon (the so-called "Ode of Sarai"), the version of 2 Sam. 22 that is found in Targum Jonathan, a selection of ten Targumic poems preserved in the Genizah Manuscripts, thirteen *madrashe* by Ephrem the Syrian (*Carmina Nisibena* 35-42 and *Hymni de Fide* 81-85 "On the Pearl") and three *piyyutim* by the Samaritan poet Marka (a contemporary of Ephrem the Syrian).

The greater part of this book consists of a rather loosely composed continuous commentary of the selected texts (the original texts and their translations have been printed as well). In this commentary the author deals in the first place with literary and stylistic aspects, such as the use of acrostichon, rhyme, metre, the reconstruction and the translation of difficult passages and the composition of the poems. Time and again, however, the theological content of several texts is discussed as well, and in his commentary on the *madrashe* of Ephrem the Syrian and on the Samaritan Marka the author points sometimes to parallels in rabbinical exegesis and theology.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

This study is of interest for several reasons. First, though based on a limited anthology of poems, it gives a lively impression of the richness of Aramaic poetry. It becomes clear from the numerous comparisons that Aramaic religious poetry was a more or less coherent phenomenon extending beyond the boundaries of regions, dialects and . . . religions (p. 290). Further, R's monograph is of particular relevance for the study of Syriac Christianity, especially the poetry of Ephrem the Syrian and the literary genre of the *madrasha*. In fact, when one reads the majority of the relevant scholarly publications, one gets the impression that the Syriac madrasha was an original Syriac Christian creation invented one century or so before Ephrem by Bardaisan, his mysterious son Harmonius or an unknown poet. Only a few scholars have pointed to the parallels and the connections between Syriac and Jewish Aramaic poetry (R. mentions in this regard E. Werner, J. Schirmann, E. Fleischer and S. Brock). From R's monograph, however, one may learn that the Syriac *madrasha*, as well as some related literary genres are not as unique and original as they are often supposed to be. Apart from some specific characteristics, such as isosyllabism, they are no more and no less than examples of Aramaic poetry and, as such, closely related to Jewish and Samaritan Aramaic liturgical poems. In the search for the origin of Syriac poetry more attention should be given to this fact.

3435 GR *Nieuwegein*, Velduil 64 G. ROUWHORST

BOOKS RECEIVED

Augustinus-Lexikon, herausgegeben von Cornelius Mayer *et alii*, Vol. 2, Vorspann & Fasc. 1/2: Cor-Deus, Basel: Schwabe & Co. A.G. 1996, Vorspann pp. i-xlvii; Text 320 Spalten, ISBN 3-7965-1007-8, SFr. 65,—/ DM 78,—/ öS 605,—(Broschiert).

Blázquez, José María, *Intelectuales, ascetas y demonios al final de la Antigüedad*, Madrid: Cátedra 1998, 566 pp., ISBN 84-376-1499-6 (pb).

Campenhausen, Hans von, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, Peabody Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers 1997, vii + 308 pp., ISBN 1-56563-272-9 (hardback with book jacket)—Reprint of J.A. Baker's fine English translation of this classic, which was first published by A. & C. Black, London, 1969.

Cirillo, Luigi & Alois van Tongerloo (edd.): *Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale di Studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico," Arcavacata di Rende—Amantea, 31 agosto-5 settembre 1993* (Manichaean Studies iii), Turnhout: Brepols 1997, x + 460 pp., ISBN 2-503-50602-x, BEF 2950 (hb).

Decret, François, *Le christianisme en Afrique du Nord ancienne*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil 1996, 302 pp., ISBN 2-02-022774-6, FF 150 (pb).—Introduction à l'histoire du christianisme en Afrique du Nord écrit par un grand spécialiste. 1. Cadre géographique et historique; 2. Aux origines de l'Église d'Afrique; 3. Tertullien, "le maître"; 4. Persécutions et crises en Afrique au milieu du III^{e} siècle; 5. Cyprien, "pape" de Carthage; 6. Organisation et vie des Églises d'Afrique au III^{e} siècle; 7. Schisme donatiste et rupture de la chrétienté africaine; 8. Diversité du paysage religieux africain dans l'Antiquité tardive; 9. Augustin d'Hippone et la gloire de la Grande Église; 10. Dernières étapes de l'Église d'Afrique: de l'invasion vandale au Maghreb arabe. Carte, tableau chronologique, bibliographie, index.

Dillon, John M., *The Great Tradition. Further Studies in the Development of Platonism and Early Christianity*, Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum 1997, xii + 346 pp., ISBN 0-86078 671 4, £ 55.00 (hb).

Gieschen, Charles A., *Angelomorphic Christology. Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums xlii), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1998, xvi + 403 pp., ISBN 90-04-10840-8, DFL 185/US $ 109 (clothbound with book jacket).

Horbury, William, *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1998, viii + 342 pp., ISBN 0 567 08590 2, £ 27, 95 (clothbound with book jacket).—Reprint (with slight changes) of twelve essays on Jewish-Christian contact and controversy by this eminent specialist. With an extensive Introduction (pp. 1-42) on (i) "Jewish Unity and the Benediction of the *Minim*," (ii) "Jewish and Christian Polemic in Antiquity," (iii) "Jews and Christians on the Bible," (iv) "Early Christians on Jewish Prayer," and (v) "Mediaeval and Early Modern Jewish Polemic." With excellent Indices (by D.W. Chapman).

Lausberg, Heinrich, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*, edited by David E. Orton & R. Dean Anderson, Foreword by George A. Kennedy, Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen & David E. Orton, Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 1998

1998, xxix + 921 pp., ISBN 90-04-10705-3, DFL 408.50/US $ 240.50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Lieu, Samuel N.C., *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies xlv), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1998, xiii + 258 pp., ISBN 90-04-10405-4, DFL165/US $ 97 (clothbound with book jacket).

Livingstone, Elizabeth A. (ed.), *Studia Patristica. Papers presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1995. Vol. XXIX: Historica, Theologica et Philosophica, Critica et Philologica. Vol. XXX: Biblica et Apocrypha, Ascetica, Liturgica. Vol. XXXI: Preaching, Second Century, Tertullian to Arnobius, Egypt before Nicaea. Vol. XXXII: Athanasius and his opponents, Cappadocian Fathers, other Greek writers after Nicaea. Vol. XXXIII: Augustine and his opponents, Jerome, other Latin Fathers after Nicaea, Orientalia [with Index Patrum and Table of Contents of Vols. XXIX-XXXIII]*, Leuven: Peeters 1997, xvi + 520 pp., vii + 410 pp., viii + 568 pp., viii + 409 pp., ix + 612 pp., ISBN 90-6831-836-5/840-3/847-0/854-3/868-3, BEF 3500 per vol. (pb).

Malherbe, Abraham J., Frederick W. Norris, James W. Thompson (edd.), *The Early Church in Its Context. Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum xc), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1998, xviii + 362 pp., ISBN 90-04-10832-7, DFL 220/US $ 129,50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Mikkelsen, Gunner B., *Bibliographia Manichaica. A Comprehensive Bibliography of Manichaeism through 1996* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia I), Turnhout: Brepols 1997, xlvi + 314 pp., ISBN 2-503-50653-4, BEF 2950 (hb).

Pietri, Charles, *Christiana Respublica. Éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 234), Roma: École française de Rome 1997 [Diffusion en France: Diffusion de Boccard, Paris; Diffusion en Italie: <L'Erma> di Breitschneider, Roma], 1684 pp. en trois volumes, ISBN (édition complète) 2-7283-0382-7 (pb).—Réimpression anastatique de maintes études de ce celèbre savant, successeur de H.-I. Marrou comme titulaire de la chaire d'Histoire du Christianisme à la Sorbonne et, de 1983 à 1991, directeur de l'École française de Rome. Volume I: Roma christiana; Empire et Église; Patristique et ecclésiologie. Volume II: Société chrétienne; Hagiographie. Volume III: Épigraphie chrétienne. Avec deux indices (d'auteurs et de personnages antiques/non antiques). Préface par André Mandouze.

Sheridan, J. Mark, *Rufus of Shotep: Homilies on the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary* (Unione Accademica Nazionale, Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari), Roma: Centro Italiano Microfiches 1998 [Distributed by Casalini Libri, via Benedetto da Maiano 3, 50014 Fiesole (Firenze)], 360 pp., ISBN 88-85354-05-X, L. 70.000 (pb).

Teodoreto di Cirro, *Commentario alla lettera ai Romani.* Traduzione di Lella Scarampi, introduzione e note di Francesca Cocchini, Roma: Boral 1998, 230 pp., ISBN 88-263-1226-5, L. 32.000 (pb).

Vogüé, Adalbert de, *De Saint Pachôme à Jean Cassien. Études littéraires et doctrinales sur le monachisme égyptien à ses débuts* (Studia Anselmiana 120), Roma: Centro Studi S. Anselmo 1996 [Co-distributore: Herder, Roma], 532 pp., ISBN 88-8139-079-5, L. 85.000 (pb).—Recueil de quinze études sur Pachôme et ses successeurs (pp. 17-267) et de neuf études sur Cassien et sa postérité (pp. 271-522) par un spécialiste très renommé. Avec une Préface (7-12), des Addenda (523-530) et un feuillet mobile des Corrigenda. Manque des Indices.

Wallace, Richard & Wynne Williams, *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus*, London-New York: Routledge 1998, xiii + 239 pp., ISBN 0-415-13591-5, £ 40.00 (hb)/0-415-13592-3, £ 12.99 (pb).

Wurst, Gregor (ed.), *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library, Psalm Book, Part II, Fasc. I, Die Bema-Psalmen* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Coptica, I, Liber Psalmorum, Pars II, Fasc. I), Turnhout: Brepols 1996, [xii +] 140 S. + 8 Tafel, ISBN 2-503-50526-0, BEF 2750 (clothbound).